

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

Online Meeting
Via GoToWebinar

May 27, 2020

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Yeates called the meeting to order at 10:55 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Beyer, Ms. Berkbigler, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Cashman, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hicks, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Yeates

Members absent: Mr. Rice

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Marchetta said Agenda Item Number V., Consent Calendar will be heard after Agenda Item Number VII., Planning Matters.

Mr. Yeates deemed the agenda approved as modified.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Yeates said he provided some edits to Ms. Ambler.
Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the April 22, 2020 as amended.
Motion carried.

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. April Financials
2. Release of Washoe County Water Quality Interest Mitigation Funds (\$26,500), and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Mitigation Funds (\$5,115) for Implementation of the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District (NTCD) Washoe County TMDL
3. West Lake Tahoe Regional Water Treatment Plant Project; 6100 West Lake Boulevard, APN 098-330-004, 098-330-001, 098-330-015, 098-330-023, and 098-350-015, Placer County, California, TRPA file number ERSP2019-1374.
4. APC Membership Reappointment for the Douglas County Lay Member, Garth Alling
5. Resolution approving Quagga/Zebra Mussel Infestation Prevention Fee Grant Program Application and Funding Agreement in the amount of \$399,989.81

Ms. Aldean said that the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of item numbers one and two.

Public Comments & Questions

Mary Ghiglione-Peterson said she's a homeowner in Chamberlands which has been in their family for 45 years. Their home is at the intersection of Lodge Drive and Flicker. The plans for this Water Treatment plant greatly concern their family. 1) Lodge Drive (at Highway 89) is already greatly impacted with beach traffic/parking in the summer for Chambers Landing Beach/Chamberlands community neighborhood. 2) If there's construction at this corner, the neighborhood will be even more impacted by overflow parking by both construction crews and day visitors. 3) Their neighborhood already has Lodge Drive which is a staging area for waste management two days of the week. How will waste management be affected? 4) Highway 89 was just resurfaced in this area within the last three years. As this will project will be impacting the crossing of Highway 89, how will TRPA ensure the 'new' roads will be maintained? 5) The preliminary drawings do not give enough information on the appearance of the said plant in the neighborhood. Please provide more detailed renderings. 6) How long will said construction project take (months/years?) 7) This is a family/residential area, especially so in the summer months, with a lot of children on the roads. How will TRPA ensure of the safety of both homeowners and visitors crossing the road during construction? 8) How will TRPA deal with the public walking and biking path along the highway during construction as many children are on these paths? 9) Will construction affect the small meadow path at the end of road to the beach, on the 'land' side of Highway 89?

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates said there was a conduit made available for this project to resurface Highway 89 and he doesn't believe that they are tearing up the road for their water line. This project is to take a temporary water line and make it permanent.

Ms. Berkgigler moved approval of the consent calendar.

*Ms. Gustafson recused herself from Consent Calendar Item Number 3.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Berkgigler, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Cashman, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, *Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

Ms. Aldean moved to adjourn as the TRPA and convene as the TMPO.

Motion carried.

VI. TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Lake Tahoe Transportation Overall Work Program for FY 2021

Ms. Aldean said there were some minor clerical changes under the Executive Summary on page 171 of the staff packet. Some of the figures specifically under WE 103, Public Outreach and Coordination, that amount should be \$214,834. Under WE 104 that amount was \$497,568. At the top of the page, WE 101, Overall Work Program and Administration, two of the numbers were transposed and the amount should be \$147,976. With the exception of those corrections, the

Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of item number one.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Novasel said the work program is an excellent report and that they also heard this at the Tahoe Transportation District Board meeting. The board members did share some concerns at the time about the procedural operations as far as how it relates to governance and the boards. There are various boards that deal with transportation that it can be confusing and overwhelming of who is doing what and when. She suggested that an external organizational chart put in place where they can see what the duties are of the specific agencies. Regarding Covid-19, they're seeing precedented changes and possible effects of Covid on the short and long term. She would like to see something added to the work program so they can have conversations about that. The staff report mentioned that they didn't feel that the changes would be substantial in the long run. In the meantime, it may be good to establish a subcommittee or additional work on the effects of Covid on the short and long term.

Ms. Marchetta said regarding the organizational chart. There are many agencies within the basin that deal with transportation. It's very difficult to create a single organizational chart related to transportation because there are so many different agencies and each play different roles. There are many different implementors and then there's TRPA who plays an overarching role. There are three predominant functions in transportation that derive from different statutory authorities. We are the federally designated Transportation Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO). We are also by statute are considered the California Regional Transportation Planning Agency. The Compact gives TRPA authority over transportation with respect to developing a transportation element of the Regional Plan. As the TMPO, they developed a Regional Transportation Plan and as the Bi-State Compact Agency, they developed a Regional Transportation Plan as an element of the overall Regional Plan. There are many different functions under those three authorities. Staff would be happy to meet with any board member that would like to have a better understanding of all the different moving parts in transportation and all of the different agencies that play a role in planning and implementation of what are the complex statutory authorities around completing the transportation system at the planning and implementation level for the Tahoe region. Regarding the effects of Covid on the transit and transportation funding, staff could put together a report on that.

Mr. Haven said Mr. Kasman will cover in Agenda Item Number VII.B, Regional Transportation Assumptions, some of the data that we have or can obtain around the Covid impact, particularly on travel within in the Basin That may be the appropriate time to discuss more broadly what Ms. Novasel was referring to on how the Governing Board and TRPA are responding.

Ms. Novasel said more of what she was referring to was about possibly establishing a summit between some of the different boards to discuss board policy and procedures in transportation because there seems to be some overlap or confusion on who is doing what at a board level rather than at the staff level. The staff seems to be working well together.

Public Comments & Questions

Carole Black, Incline Village resident said planning, management and oversight of transportation in the Tahoe Basin and adjoining areas has burgeoned into a very complex, confusing undertaking

with diverse constituencies. She counts around 50 items in the Work Program Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations. Though some refer to legislation or physical items, the majority reference constituents or government/quasi-government agencies, commissions, districts, etc. With this complexity resulting in important public concerns being lost, as an impacted resident she requested attention to these areas:

Work Element 103, Public Outreach & Communication: Detailed outreach lists are noted with a "Public Participation Plan." However, since important public concerns have been lost in deliberations to date and with Incline Village uniquely positioned within Washoe County to understand Tahoe area transportation/parking/traffic-related issues and impacts, Incline Village community reps should be included along with Washoe County reps on applicable TRPA Transportation related bodies. In addition, well publicized access for residents to text/email priority alerts regarding Transportation Initiatives would be helpful.

WE 104/108, Regional & Sustainable Communities Planning: Much complex planning regarding "around lake" and some area transport are listed. But there is no attention to impacts/needs in areas like Incline Village where parking/traffic is often an unsafe nightmare driven by unmanaged tourism with transportation schemes which ignore community impacts and geography. Transportation, vehicle emission, sustainable community planning must consider community impacts. For Incline Village, this has not occurred with this plan nor with the Tahoe Transportation District and TRPA to date.

WE 105, Transport Data Management & Forecasting: Six elements are tracked with no focused follow-up regarding resident concerns or metric deterioration, e.g., old data regarding collisions, traffic volumes, congestion; No plan regarding Incline Village 2018 congestion increase; ELT Express volume rise 2016 to 2018, and trail, pedestrian/bike use with no analysis of user origin or parking impacts. She asked that these gaps be addressed.

Ronda Tycer said regarding reducing greenhouse emissions in Tahoe. The problems are: 1) To reduce air pollution caused by motor vehicles, you need to reduce the number of motor vehicles. "Visitors account for over 10 million cars annually (2018 data)." Your projected ever-increasing tourist traffic in the Tahoe Basin, especially during peak visitation times requires a new approach to saving the lake. 2) The only way to save the lake from over-tourism is to limit the number of tourists allowed in the Basin per day. It's been estimated that about 20 million people visit Lake Tahoe each year (Tahoe Fund.org). Lake Tahoe needs no marketing campaign. Day-trippers need no advertising. 3) Tourists need to pay the costs of transportation impacts on Lake Tahoe clarity. As per your report, tourists make 80 percent or more of all Vehicle Miles Traveled in the Tahoe Basin. Tourists around the world are accustomed to paying entrance fees to enjoy the benefits of areas in which they don't pay taxes. Moreover, the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on Federal and State budgets will be severe in the near future. User fees can offset a reduction in available government funding.

Solutions: First-Implement a computerized system allowing a limited number of tourists into Lake Tahoe on a daily basis during summer. Create this computerized monitoring system instead of building multimillion-dollar transportation facilities: 1) Create a system by which tourists can go on-line to purchase a Tahoe Basin Pass, limiting the number of passes available per day. 2) Create entry stations at the seven access points into the Basin where cameras photograph pass-stickers on cars to allow entry. 3) Create parking lots/mobility hubs at as many of the seven access points

as feasible where tourists without auto passes can park for free and take bus/trolley public transit into the Tahoe Basin. Second-Recognize that over-tourism is as dangerous to Lake Tahoe as greenhouse gasses. Redirect funds used for national and global advertising into promoting local recreation, entertainment, services and facilities in the Basin. Third-Use funds from Tahoe Basin Passes to fund transportation projects. Create many convenient small mobility hubs strategically throughout the basin, but no large expensive bus stations (ala Tahoe City). In summary, TRPA and TTD need to lower demand for roads and parking in the Tahoe Basin rather than try to keep up with increasing demand as projected by the 2045 forecasts. Current plans will not reduce greenhouse gas in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The only way to reduce the impact of tourist automobiles is to limit the number of tourist automobiles. Significant investment in alternative infrastructure and transit systems should be modeled on computerized systems already in use that can be adapted for TRPA/TTD in the Basin. More transit hubs and parking lots will not reduce the impact of greenhouse gas on the lake.

Ms. Aldean said they also heard these comments at the Operations and Governance Committee meeting and staff is already engaging with the submitters of those comments.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the TMPO consent calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Berkgigler, Mr. Bruce, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Beyer, Mr. Cashman, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

Ms. Aldean moved to adjourn as the TMPO and reconvene as the TRPA.

Motion carried.

VII. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Presentation and Acceptance of FY 2020/2021 Operations Work Plan Priorities

Ms. Marchetta said each year at this time staff presents TRPA's work program that accompanies the Governing Board's annual budget approval. The Operations and Governance Committee previewed the budget at their meeting this morning. Next year's budget will be coming for approval to the Operations and Governance Committee and the Governing Board in June. That budget implements the work initiatives for the coming year. In presenting next year's work plan priorities, staff wanted to acknowledge some points that were made at the Operations and Governance Committee this morning and expand on those. They wanted to acknowledge that putting both budget and work program together they understand that we're in uncertain and ambiguous times. Any plan put forward this year needs to be nimble and adaptable as we go. We understand that what's in front of us is in this indeterminate period of necessary austerity. What is being proposed is premised on and can be accomplished within the planned and anticipated reductions in funding that we are expecting from the two states. This work program is not premised on a status quo budget, rather it's based on a reduced budget and what cuts we already know about and can expect. Staff recognizes that the world cannot stop and there's this equal and opposite drive to rebuild an economy that's in now severe contractions. We've built this work program and its priorities around a careful consideration of initiatives that could potentially tie to

and support likely state, federal, and local federal stimulus priorities. They've built the work priorities around the foundations of implementing the Compact and the Regional Plan. The Compact gives clear foundations that tie to those stimulus priorities such as transportation and housing. Those are firm foundations that we can fall back on that are also consistent with some of the board's prior strategic direction. These priorities have been built to include actions that link up across each priority and are synergistic and were done to get the biggest bang for the buck for the time and money spent under each of these during this period of what we're anticipating to be very austere times.

TRPA team member Mr. Hester provided the presentation.

Mr. Hester said today's presentation will cover the priorities for what we often call the strategic initiatives but will not go into the detail of the entire work program. A lot of that is items staff does as important core activities such as permitting but will not be highlighting that in this presentation. He thanked the staff in all divisions for their work on this. A special thank you to the leads for the six initiatives that will be presented today. Those staff members are Devin Middlebrook, Michelle Glickert, Karen Fink, Kim Caringer, Dan Segan, and Ken Kasman.

There was a number of criteria used for deciding what to recommend to the board. Again, it implements the Regional Plan and agency resources. A lot of it is progress in continuing the current priorities that were given to staff by the board. There are some changes in state policy and have also tried to take into consideration how the operating environment is changing with items such as Covid-19.

The six priorities are: Building Resiliency: Climate Change and Sustainability; Keeping Tahoe Moving: Transportation and Sustainable Recreation; Tahoe Living: Housing and Community Revitalization; Restoration Blueprint: EIP Implementation; Measuring What Matters: Thresholds and Monitoring Update; Digital First: Innovation Initiative.

Building Resiliency: Climate Change and Sustainability: Devin Middlebrook, Sustainability Program Coordinator is lead. This builds on the 2014 Sustainability Action Plan that won both California and the National American Planning Association awards. Approximately 76 percent of those action items in that plan have been wholly or partially implemented. The 2005 and 2010 greenhouse gas inventories received \$100,000 grant funding from the California Tahoe Conservancy. Staff is currently in process to solicit proposals to update that greenhouse gas inventory. The top three sources of greenhouse gas emissions in 2005 and 2010 are energy, transportation, and fuel combustion. Energy is where we get credited for the electric energy that we use within the basin. If it's generated at a coal plant outside the basin but imported in, we would be responsible for those equivalent greenhouse gas emissions. That is largely being dealt with through both states as they passed portfolio requirements requiring renewables for energy generation. It also shows up in the region in the form of solar panels and batteries where that can be counted toward the renewable portfolio. Transportation is one of the areas that shows up in stricter auto emissions, less vehicle miles traveled, fleets switching from fossil fuel to electric vehicles and hydrogen fuel. A few years ago, TRPA won an award for the joint plug-in vehicle plan that they did with the Tahoe Donner Public Utility District. Between both agencies they covered the corridor from Highway 50 to Interstate 80 and that plan is now being implemented. Fuel combustion is heating, cooking, and how fuel is used within buildings. That's being addressed through current building codes. As there are structures being redeveloped and the new development then that fuel combustion goes down

as well as the air quality mitigation funds to take out woodstoves as a part of the 2012 Regional Plan. Two other aspects of climate change are adaptation which is what will change and what we can do to adapt to that change and resiliency which is about response and recovery after a climate related events such as fire or floods.

What do we expect as the climate change happens? Built on the most climate change scenarios and what was done as part of the Water for the Seasons Project that covered the Truckee Carson River system from Lake Tahoe to Pyramid Lake and Lahontan Reservoir. The institutions involved in that were the United States Geological Survey, University of Nevada, Reno, Desert Research Institute, and Ohio University. This graph [Building-Resiliency-Climate-Change-Sustainability Lake-Elevation](#) shows on the vertical axis the lake level in increments. The bottom orange line is 6,223 feet where the bottom of the spillway is at the dam. The top dashed orange line is 6,229.1 feet or the top of the freeboard at the dam. The Truckee Carson River system is considered in drought if we drop below the dashed line at 6,223 feet and is flood stage if above that. The horizontal axis is the frequency or percentage probability that the water level will be at any one of those intervals on the vertical axis in any one year. If you added the blue bars up to 100 percent is historically what's happened to the lake level. Approximately three percent of the time it was in the 6,221 to 6,223 foot level below that bottom line which means a drought and one percent of the time it was above 6,229.1 to 6,223 range. The orange bars are a scenario where they're assuming mid-century greenhouse gas reduction or greenhouse gas mitigation. Those orange bars show that approximately one percent of the time it will be in a deeper drought at 6,219 to 6,221 and approximately five percent of the time will be a milder drought at 6,221 to 6,223. Above 6,229 is about 23 percent chance that it will be in that first range of 6,229.1 to 6,231 and two percent greater than 6,231. The gray bars are the scenario that shows greenhouse gas mitigation happening at the end of the century. Approximately one percent of the drought now occurs at an even deeper level at 6,216 to 6,219, the bottom range on the vertical axis. Two percent in the 6,219 to 6,221 range and four percent in the 6,221 to 6,223 range. On the flooding side there's about a 24 percent chance in the 6,229.1 to 6,231 range and four percent greater than 6,231. The point is that we will have more drought and flooding, and more extreme weather. For the people who provide wastewater, water, transportation facilities, etc. are going to need to adapt those facilities for these floods and droughts. The second part of this initiative is working with those infrastructure providers.

We've talked about mitigation and how they're going to reduce greenhouse gas emissions attributed to the region, how we're going to approach adaptation resilience working with the appropriate public safety providers and others about what we do when we have one of these climate related disasters.

Keeping Tahoe Moving: Transportation and Sustainable Recreation: Michelle Glickert, Principal Transportation Planner is the lead. This includes mobile greenhouse gas emissions being reduced which is a requirement in the Sustainable Communities Strategy part of the Regional Transportation Plan. It also includes housing which is the next initiative showing that these are all intertwined and there's synergy. This is putting housing into the communities to also change the transportation patterns, it's not just transportation facilities. The four components of this initiative are the update of the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. It implements the vision for the mixed use communities and housing and a transportation system that has pedestrian, bicycle, and transit oriented development. It also achieves the mobile greenhouse gas reduction. The second component is the bi-state consultation transportation

action plan which is in process now. That group is closing in on the near term priorities out of the Regional Transportation Plan Sustainable Communities Strategies that picked the highest priority projects and are moving into funding strategies. The third part of the transportation initiative is the Sustainable Recreation Plan. We were a destination where people came to buildings with parking facilities and drove here. We are now becoming is a destination for recreation visitors who that come to places now where there may or may not be adequate facilities for parking or transportation. Sustainable recreation planning aims to coordinate the new transportation needs for these recreational visitors with the facilities to address the shift in what the visitor looks like. Some of the corridor planning involving many agencies is the State Route 28 corridor that has the three mile trail from Incline Village to Sand Harbor. Plans are underway for the extension from Sand Harbor to Spooner Summit. The US 50 East Shore corridor from Spooner to the South Shore is now getting underway. On the South Shore is the Mainstreet Management Plan. There's the State Route 89 corridor to Emerald Bay, and on the Northwest part of the basin, in Placer County is the State Route 89/28 corridor.

Tahoe Living: Housing and Community Revitalization: Karen Fink, Housing Ombudsman is the lead. Housing is a key component of communities and is focused on that. It addresses the Regional Transportation Plan Sustainable Communities Strategy. There are number of key components that make communities successful; a clean and healthy environment, access to services and facilities, recreation, and housing. TRPA has worked with the Mountain Housing Council for the North Shore even out of the basin into Nevada County and Truckee. On the South Shore, the Tahoe Prosperity Center has worked with El Dorado County, Douglas County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe. Washoe County has not been included in either of these initiatives but are being included in our work. They've worked on creating an analysis framework to identify the root causes and feel the three root causes of the problems in the Tahoe region are the cost of construction, development requirements, and affordability. What they've done in addition to the root cause analysis is added the housing proforma to analyze the impacts of development rights and the cost of construction. The economist who developed the housing proforma has helped to tweak this and understand it to use it to evaluate items such as if there was no land cost. They've also looked at affordability. The goal is to work with the local governments on their programs and ensure that at the regional level we are adding value to what's happening at the local level. The plan is to take this work along with the work of the local governments, the Mountain Housing Council, and the Tahoe Prosperity Center and establish a working group with Governing Board members, key staff from the local governments, and others who can make recommendations to the Local Government and Housing Committee, the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, and Governing Board.

Restoration Blueprint: EIP Implementation: Kim Caringer, Environmental Improvement Division Manager is the lead. Infrastructure, sustainability, and community revitalization, and housing projects will be identified and added to the Environmental Improvement Program. This needs to happen in order to implement those initiatives. There is continuing work to seek new funding. The Forest Health and Wildfire Committee are discussing implementation ideas and actions that they would like to see come out of the Lake Tahoe West work. There's the Aquatic Invasive Species Control Action Plan Agenda which has the Tahoe Keys at the top of that list. In stormwater management the focus is changing to area wide stormwater management projects. The Ski Run mountain to marina project is a project that they received a large grant for and is a good example of multi objective, multi benefit project. Heavenly California Base may be able to meet its BMP requirements potentially on Forest Service lands. It will have parking with permeable pavement and stormwater treatments. They're coordinating the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act funded Aquatic

Invasive Species control project at the Ski Run Marina. They're also planning for flooding and drought due to the weather fluctuations, enhancing the bike and pedestrian connectivity as well as safe routes to school. Also, enhancing recreation to Forest Service lands and look at stream environment zones and wildlife enhancement opportunities.

Measuring What Matters: Thresholds and Monitoring Update: Dan Segan, Principal Natural Resource Analyst is the lead. This is the continuation of the work that the Science Council recommended and the Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholders Working Group recommended which is a new framework based on the best science, conceptual models, results chains like major organizations and investors use, and TRPA management actions to get to the desired outcomes of the Regional Plan, the Code of Ordinances, and Environmental Improvement Program. This is taking that further with a focus on items such as the improvements already done on the threshold system. They're looking at all of the measures and priorities in the near term are water quality, transportation, recreation, and stream environment zones. That work will continue and is critical to all of the initiatives.

Digital First: Innovation Initiative: Ken Kasman, Research and Analysis Division Manager is the lead. The first question that should be asked when we're doing something – is it can we do this digitally? All of the information resources that we create and all of the applications that we use such as the software for applicants to submit for development permits. For example, the software we use to interact with them on credit card transactions, and some of the software staff uses for our internal applications such as the mobile devices that Code Compliance and the Forester use. All those are examples where TRPA has already gone to digital and areas where we can advance further. The priorities that have been identified for the near term are adding more information to the online parcel development information on Lake Tahoe Info, improve the land capability verification system, and modernize the Code of Ordinances to make it digital.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.A-Operations-Work-Plan-Priorities.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Lawrence said these are all extremely important initiative items for the basin. Climate, transportation, housing, environmental restoration, and science are critical but said those are really large buckets. When he thinks of past initiatives that were extremely large as well but were more specific like commodities or the shoreline initiative. He asked what's the process moving forward and working with stakeholders and the board to identify specific milestones or benchmarks to ensure we're making the progress and on the same page with our stakeholders.

Ms. Marchetta said there are very clear entry points into each of these initiatives. Those entry points are a continuation of what we are already working on. There's a huge cross cutting theme across this that relates to transportation that builds off of what we're currently doing in the Regional Transportation Plan update, what we are doing to modify the vehicle miles traveled threshold to convert it from for example, the VMT threshold was a nitrate measurement and then converting that to a greenhouse gas measurement. The first entry point in climate is transportation. Both of the states have made transportation the top priority for greenhouse gas reduction. That's the overlap point and the entry point. For each of these initiatives that it's not as

broad as it seems. These could become multi-year initiatives, but the entry point is clear and ties off of what we're already working on.

Mr. Lawrence agreed that there are a lot of entry points. If this moves forward, reports back to the board on more specifics and details on where these entry points are would help with communication not only with the Governing Board but also with the stakeholders.

Ms. Marchetta said staff will continue to make it clear and transparent as we move forward.

Ms. Novasel said we're all having discussions and making changes with the Covid pandemic. It's not just about economics, but also lifestyle changes. With the possibility of having more people in Tahoe telecommuting it could change the housing and transportation. She promoted that there be a Covid subcommittee type of process so we can stay on top of changes.

Ms. Marchetta agreed and said they're monitoring what these changing pressures are as a result of Covid particularly on housing. We can see the potential pressures that may come from people relocating here. It will have to be monitored and is the point of convening perhaps broader stakeholders on these housing issues so we can set priorities as to what is the right entry point to start working on housing. The local governments have obligations that are coming in from the states related to the regional housing needs allocations requirements that are in the Regional Transportation Plan. Making sure that the states aren't financially penalized for not meeting those regional housing needs requirements would be one of the first priorities in housing. Continuing to focus on affordability and achievability of housing would be important.

Ms. Faustinos said she agreed with Mr. Lawrence that there should be a tracking mechanism so we can see how we're progressing towards meeting these work program goals. A dashboard would be very helpful to monitor where we are in meeting those goals.

Ms. Gustafson said all of these goals are reliant on us working with all the other entities in the basin and the local jurisdictions to ensure that we can implement. She asked if this would come back to the board for further discussion and review or is today the final opportunity to weigh in.

Ms. Marchetta said today would be to accept these as top level priorities and not dig into the actual text of the work plan itself which is more of an operations document that helps guide the staff in terms of setting their individual work programs.

Ms. Gustafson said receiving reports on how we're measuring that success would be informative.

Mr. Hester said for example, a lot of the other items in the work plan are items such as processing permits in a specified amount of days of application receipt. The board will receive a copy of the work plan in June. In it will be answers to some of Mr. Lawrence's questions. He will discuss the idea of a dashboard or report that could be provided to the board on a regular basis. Many of these initiatives already have scheduled board presentations.

Mr. Yeates said had we done the retreat this year, we would have spent much more time on these priorities. It's always been the practice that staff will come back with a completed work plan. It may be modified as time moves on, but we are not locked in. He's even encouraged staff to go

outside of it on a few issues. It's very flexible and fluid but a good idea to set priorities but unfortunately this year, we did not have the opportunity to sit together and review this.

Public Comments & Questions

Carole Black, Incline Village resident said Agenda Item Number VII proposals include A) Operations Work Plan 2020-21 Priorities with focus on environmental impacts and reducing emissions; sustainable communities/recreation and focused corridor planning. B) 2020 Transportation Plan Forecasting adding Short Term Rental volume to prior metrics but based only on "2018" model day" and thus likely underestimated. Covid-19 is addressed, but not potential future model adjustment based on new census data or tourism info. What's missing? Significant local trends with targeted planning to address are omitted. The examples listed below focus on Incline Village but may also apply to other small Tahoe areas.

Specific concerns include: Significant 2019 visitor increases are not included, both overnight stays in short term rentals and day trips to East Lake Tahoe Trail/Sand Harbor shuttle. Comprehensive remediation for overall vehicle impacts is not addressed, e.g., parking; traffic; safety at intersections and for snow or evacuation; roadside surface disruption w/lake debris. Local input is not integrated, e.g., housing needs, adverse impacts of transportation options and community needs/priorities. Local geographic challenges are not considered, i.e., much of Incline Village is on a significant incline and often treacherous impacting safe mobility choices. All data is not considered, and priority follow-up data not planned, i.e., regarding short term rental volumes/vehicles and day visitor arrival/parking patterns and impacts.

Examples of missing considerations: ELT: New Trail had avg 800–1000 trips/day summer 2019; where are they from and where parking? Sand Harbor shuttle rides grew by 49 percent, summer 2016 to 2019; also ? day visits with Incline Village parking. Incline Village congestion data shows 2018 increase. Data needed for Reno/Carson visitors who use Mt Rose Ski/Spooner hubs, not Incline Village hub, for larger drop in area VMT/cars/ and parking. For Short Term Rentals: 23 percent more transient occupancy tax nights summer 2019 with added cars/VMT/unsafe traffic and parking. Study needed: Restricted parking and local van shuttles for safety, fewer cars/trips and less lake debris. She asked to please address these issues in TRPA plans.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Gustafson made a motion to accept the TRPA 2020/2021 Operations Work Plan priorities included in this staff report.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Berkgigler, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Cashman, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

- B. Land Use and Population Assumptions Used in the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan Forecasting
TRPA team member Mr. Kasman provided the presentation.

Mr. Kasman said this modeling that we do for the Regional Transportation Plan takes time. We're bringing this to you now for your input and direction to use these forecasts and the assumptions methodology to move forward with modeling for the Regional Transportation Plan. The RTP is updated every four years and to meet the federal and state planning requirements, the forecasts for this RTP will cover 2035 and 2045. They're laying out the most likely scenarios for what the region will look like in 2045. These forecasts are input into the travel demand model then to identify the programs and projects in the RTP and to evaluate the effectiveness of the RTP in meeting the vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas reduction goals.

We forecast to be able to plan, to layout the vision and the expectations for the transportation system, to identify the projects, plans, and policies that enable us to achieve the greenhouse gas and vehicle miles traveled reduction targets. We forecast and model to see what happens when the plan is implemented and then reevaluate the plans to ensure we're meeting the goals. This is part of the adaptive management cycle that's built into the planning process. Because the plans are reevaluated every four years, there's a much larger adaptive management cycle that circles the entire process. All forecasting involves uncertainty and is continually being reevaluated through adaptive management and updating these forecasts every four years when new plans are produced.

In 2018, staff convened a model working group to be a technical group to provide guidance and recommendations to staff as updates are made to the modeling capabilities. This group is comprised of technical staff from Caltrans and the Nevada Department of Transportation, the Tahoe Transportation District, local jurisdictions, the California Attorney General's Office, business community, chamber, visitors' authorities, and environmental representatives. They've helped guide the investments and model over the past year and helped formulate the base data for the Regional Transportation Plan which is using 2018 as the base year. That year is selected because that is the most recent information available across the wide spectrum of information necessary to do this modeling. Traffic count information from the states that they calibrate the model to is 2018 which is the latest information available.

They reviewed this information being provided today with the working group yesterday and will continue to have ongoing discussions with the group and individual members about various elements of the forecast as they move through this process.

The forecast includes a whole host of metrics with a lot detail in the packet particularly in the associated appendices which begin on page 179 and 199 of the staff packet. They include both the forecast assumptions as well as background information on trends seen since 1987. TRPA's Research and Analysis team was created about six years ago and as the team built out Lake Tahoe Info, the agency now has the best data they've ever had. It's a pillar of the strategic plan to use the best science and information. Because we have better data, they've placed more focus on trend analysis and can better evaluate past trends and make more informed forecasts.

What rate should they use for the buildout of the remaining development rights? What is the expectation for regional population change? And what will happen with visitation?

These forecasts were developed prior to the effect of Covid in the community. They're not going to try and predict the long term effects of Covid at this time.

Regional Land Use: The forecast looks at development right since 1987 and particularly since the adoption of the Regional Plan Update in 2012. They looked at trends during the recessions as well as during periods of sustained economic growth. These forecast build upon the 2018 base year and look at how much, how fast, and if the remaining development rights will be constructed in the forecast period. The forecast takes into account all these past trends as well as the changes to the development rights system that were adopted that allow conversion between types within the growth caps. For commercial floor area they expect modest growth in the CFA through the forecast period in line with the post 2012 Regional Plan trend. However, they're seeing much slower consumption of CFA than has been expected in prior forecast. At the current rate, it would take about eighty years for the remaining CFA that's allowed under the Regional Plan to be used. The forecast does not buildout all of the remaining CFA by 2045.

For tourist accommodations they heard that there's a surplus of TAUs. Several large projects that this board has approved in recent years haven't been constructed. Many hotels today are serving as residential units instead of tourist accommodation. The forecast didn't include any additional tourist units other than those already approved. The forecast assumes that some hotel units will be removed, and others will be converted to residential units to help fulfill housing needs. In residential given all the focus and attention on housing at the state and local level and the discussion in the previous presentation on TRPA's housing and community revitalization initiative, they're focused on building communities in the region and reflecting these initiatives in the forecast.

The forecast meet the requirements placed on California jurisdictions through their regional housing allocations and the forecast calls for nearly 4,600 new residential units with a particular focus on multi-family, workforce, and income restricted housing, compact and transit oriented development that is fundamental to the Regional Plan and that's embedded in the local jurisdiction work to improve housing supply and affordability. As well as within the housing initiatives and the programs that were discussed in the previous presentation. The housing initiative will bring workers back to the region. Modest population growth from local effort to put housing in place for local residents and workers. This is a shift towards remote working and looking at potential urban flight into Lake Tahoe. They are forecasting that Lake Tahoe's full time residential population to increase about one half percent per year through the forecast period or about 13 percent through 2045.

For visitation, collecting, organizing, and sharing reliable information on visitation is challenging. Prior to Covid, visitation to the Tahoe region had generally been trending upward over the last several years. For example, over the last several years there's been an increase in passenger traffic through the Reno Tahoe International Airport. There's been five consecutive years of increases in passenger travel and 57 consecutive months of year over year increases in passenger growth through February 2020.

They've seen passenger vehicle traffic volumes in the region generally going up over the last several years. The mega region from which Tahoe draws many of its tourist, is expected to grow considerably over the next 25 years. They also know over the past 20 years; they've experienced a realignment and a shift in the type of visitors that we're seeing in the region. Thirty years ago, the visitation was focused around casinos. The rise of gaming in Northern California altered that dynamic considerably and people are finding that experience elsewhere. But in the tourist based economy there's an increasing interest in outdoor recreation activities that our region also offers.

They're expecting increased interest in outdoor recreation coupled with population growth outside the region to result in a modest increase in tourism in the region. The challenge faced in planning for this shift is the type of tourist and recreation activities they engage in. They're working with the partners to explore new data sources to better refine the estimates for visitation.

They've been working towards building these forecasts in the base year information for over one year. Well before Covid and the related impacts to the region and world that we're seeing. In Tahoe the short term impacts have been severe but the long term impact is uncertain. They don't know how this will play out and won't speculate. These forecasts are based on the best information and recommend that we maintain the forecast assumptions based on this data. These forecasts are for 17 and 27 years out and don't know what the long term effects will be. The Harvard Business Review recommends that in moments of unprecedented uncertainty, one must know when not to make a forecast. There are likely more elements that don't change than new things that emerge. They'll be starting to update these forecasts as early as two years from now with a much better understanding of the near term impacts, stimulus packages, and development patterns as well as the long term view of the effects of Covid. They'll also have the 2020 Census information as well as updated US Forest Service surveys on visitors to include in those analyzes.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.B-RTP-RegionalForecasts.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean referred to page 186 of the staff packet, subparagraph two, housing initiatives to transition existing housing stock. Other than the impacts of Measure T, what other factors and or initiatives are going to facilitate this transition with respect to converting the use of second homes in the long term housing? She hopes it doesn't include some form of a regulatory solution.

Mr. Kasman said the assumptions built on a lot of the work that's happened with the Mountain Housing Council as well as the Tahoe Prosperity on the South Shore which have identified a number of strategies that are likely to move the ball in terms of workforce and resident housing. The regional housing needs allocations that are required for the California jurisdictions are both at the total number of units as well as look at the distribution of those units at an income level. They've worked to include those estimates for housing that would be built over the next eight years for the housing needs allocation into these forecasts. There are other strategies that have been discussed. The initiative on housing and community revitalization will continue to look at a wide range of items like the Vail indeed program that looks at deed restrictions and other mechanisms that may have the ability to address existing housing stock in addition to new housing stock.

Ms. Aldean asked if it's realistic to assume that for example, someone who owns a second home and uses it periodically is going to want to rent it out for full time employment for a person working in the basin. She doesn't feel that's a very realistic expectation. This is focused more on new housing stock than existing housing stock when it comes to secondary homes.

Mr. Kasman said yes, they are expecting a slight decline in the percentage of unoccupied homes in the region. It assumes that there will be a shift in the percentage of occupied as that increases but also includes the new units. As you build new units, there's likely to be a portion of those units

that will go to the second home market as well. The expectation is a lower percentage of those new units will become second homes because of these housing initiatives and other strategies. For example, the use of TRPA's residential bonus units, the development rights initiative modified the requirements for bonus units and cannot be used for vacation units or for second homes. The expectation is that those units would become resident housing as opposed to vacant housing.

Ms. Novasel said on the school enrollment there was an increase of 12.4 percent by 2045. That's an increase of over 1,100 children which would have a severe impact on the schools. She asked what the assumption was for that increase.

Mr. Kasman said the expectation is that as the housing is constructed then that leads to additional population growth. As population growth increases then school enrollment increases at a proportional rate as well. The appendices have data that suggests that those trends in school enrollment and a variety of economic factors such as employment, casino revenues, etc. were significantly higher in the early 2000s and declined into the 2010 downward cycle. Over the last 8 to 10 years, we've been relatively stable or slightly upward in a lot of these trends for some of these long term economic pieces. They're projecting a return to those levels though slightly below the peak of where both population, employment, and school enrollment were in those high periods of the early 2000s.

Ms. Novasel said she didn't see the percentage of school age children it in the formula as compared to the increase in the housing stock.

Mr. Kasman said they maintained the percentages for school aged children as a percentage of the population. As the overall population numbers increased, they increased school enrollment at the same rate.

Ms. Gustafson referred to page 191 of the staff packet that shows the Tahoe mega region growth numbers far exceeding what is anticipated for increased visitation to the basin. Not only are we going to see this huge growth in the mega region but climate change and heat in these surrounding areas and potentially extensive droughts makes the number seem very low. She asked if we should be looking more at ranges of potential versus a hard number. She looks at projections and it says eight percent based on all of these factors seems like it's on the low end. Should we be thinking about what if it isn't that and should the range be much greater that we're trying to address. Whether it's various scenarios or ranges on both resident population, visitation, land use, etc. it's difficult to look at a hard number, is there a potential to use ranges or various scenarios when making these estimates?

Mr. Kasman said staff could look at scenarios. The complexity that introduces in terms of having to maintain separate model runs does add complexity to that. Staff will evaluate that comment on what that would mean in terms of resources and timing for the Regional Transportation Plan. Regarding the overall growth in the mega region, they've seen significant growth in these areas over the past couple of decades in the wider states of California and Nevada as well. They have not seen the visitation numbers to Lake Tahoe spike from those population increases yet. They're trying to balance at what rate do they see visitation increase from population growth outside the region. For every three additional residents they see in those wider areas, they get about one new visitor to Lake Tahoe. This is essentially what they modeled for this assumption is about that increase. There are other factors that influence both positively and negatively these figures,

certainly, climate change and temperature patterns in the valley have an effect. There's also an effect where congestion, traffic, and travel times will start to divert those visitors to other areas if parking and other issues continue to rise. People won't want to visit anymore because of travel times or other factors.

Mr. Cashman asked if it was correct that the Research and Analysis Division is collecting and reviewing this data every year to which we're basing these assumptions.

Mr. Kasman said staff is working to build out more information and resources. Visitation is one of the most challenging in terms of getting clear information. They're looking at a variety of data sources in both ones that they've used in the past as well as new sources to help understand visitor travel behavior. They'll continue to look at wide of range to better refine these forecast over time. There are some long term data studies available such as the Forest Service visitation studies.

Mr. Cashman said basing important decisions on models and or forecast can be dangerous. He wants to ensure that we're always striving to get the best information with facts that we can because facts are better than models.

Mr. Beyer said the Employment Development Department released its April figures and in El Dorado, Placer, and Nevada Counties unemployment is running between 14 to 15 percent. In Santa Cruz County that is highly engaged in tourism for its number one industry, the unemployment rate is 20 percent for April. That's a 17 percent increase in two months. In Santa Cruz County the hospitality unemployment rate is at 68 percent. These are typically the lower wage earners and are impacted more directly with something like Covid. This is a context to the question because what we're doing is looking at assumptions in land use patterns and transportation and is tied more or less to the economic recovery of California and its impact on the basin. We don't know if the recovery will be a "V", a "U", and we don't want it to be an "L." In 2008 and 2009, there were forecasting models done and the majority of them were completely wrong. Using assumptions and then basing land use decisions on assumptions on real time may change the dynamic.

Mr. Marshall said this motion on the slide is more generic than the one in the staff packet. The proposal is to endorse the approach that was taken. This is focusing in on those three areas of visitation, population, demographics, and some of the land use basic approach. This will allow staff the flexibility to address for example, the concern that the number shouldn't be eight percent but either a range or a different single number that should be used after discussions with stakeholders and interested parties. They could move to a different number rather than the one that's particularly identified in the appendices or report. The board can do a motion or note that staff has presented the board with this information and that staff will be working with stakeholders in the future to firm up the numbers and approach that we're using best science and best available data.

Public Comments & Questions

Diane Heirshberg, Incline Village resident said she sent the Governing Board a lengthy written public comment and hopes you'll consider and use in part to provide additional directions to staff to take actions to reduce the number of vehicles coming to Lake Tahoe, both due to over-tourism,

and due to a lack of public transportation for residents and visitors at the Lake. The email addresses the following. The projections of reduced tourism and by implication reduced tourist vehicles at the Lake in 2045 should not be relied upon to ignore the need to take prompt and effective affirmative action's now, both because the staff report admits that many assumptions of reduced future tourism are potentially flawed, and most importantly because the assumption in the Chart at page 181 that there were 6,005 Short Term Rentals at the Lake in 2018, which assumption is used in all subsequent assumptions in the report, is not accurate because at page 192 staff advised that the 6,005 number only reflects permitted Short Term Rentals at the Lake. You all know that Washoe County has, and in 2018 had, no permitted short term rentals in Incline Village as there is no STR Ordinance, even though there are at least 1,000 short term rentals in Incline Village, and also other local jurisdictions at the Lake were still working to cause unpermitted short term rentals to get permits in 2019. Therefore, she believes that TRPA should begin to develop and take affirmative action now to limit the number of vehicles coming to Lake Tahoe, and has given a list of potential actions for staff to consider, and requested that they look at actions being taken in other tourist venues around the country to limit vehicular traffic and move people to public transportation. She also asked that TRPA staff be advised to get public input from residents and businesses in Incline Village and other local jurisdictions on Transportation Committee Policies and Actions, preferably appointing local public members. To get public buy-in, it is important to allow the public to be heard and to provide input of local knowledge, and to educate the public. She gave an example of TRPAs excellent efforts and results in this regard on the Short Term Rental Neighborhood Compatibility Guideline project which resulted in a good work product accepted by all. She also gave an example of a current transportation project where there has been an effort to push the project through without prior public input or notice or even adequate investigation, the potential acquisition of the former Incline Village elementary school for a Transportation Hub by the Tahoe Transportation District. She believes that the public, TRPA and the TTD can work together to come up with the best project location for all concerned by looking at other potential available Transportation Hub sites in both Incline and elsewhere. We are hoping that staff will be directed to get public input from local communities on matters affecting them.

Carl Hasty, Tahoe Transportation District asked what the plans are to modernize the transportation model and the data used to more accurately understand travel patterns and use of Tahoe given what is available in today's data? The Sustainable Communities Strategy emission goals for Tahoe appear out of sync with both the states of California and Nevada goals for greenhouse gas reduction for transportation. How will the state's goals be addressed as a region in the Regional Transportation Update, and how will that be modeled? As he understands the staff proposal, only one scenario is to be modeled, one predicated on an increase of 12 percent in resident population and a very low projection of 8 percent in visitation growth over the next 25 years. For visitation growth that is less than one third of one percent per year increase where current project analysis factors used for projects and corridor planning use one half to one percent a year growth. Over the 25 year period of the Regional Transportation Plan population growth within the drive up market external to Tahoe will be one percent or more per year. Given the confidence level of the staff assumptions and the state's greenhouse gas goals for transportation it would benefit all transportation decision makers if there were different scenarios modeled based on different growth rates of user groups. Will TRPA consider modeling more than one growth scenario for this update? Along the same line of greenhouse gas reduction, how will congestion be addressed in the Regional Transportation Plan and with modeling? How will Senate Bill 743 vehicle miles traveled goals be addressed in the RTP, will it be applied to projects on the

Nevada side, will it be applied to recreation travel growth, and will it be applied to new housing projects since our land use is fixed and we have nothing but infill or redevelopment projects? How will TRPA monitor the accuracy of its assumptions in the model over time to learn and improve forecast planning?

Sophie Wenzlau on behalf of the California Attorney General's Office said their office would like to express appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the TRPA Transportation Model Working Group. They also appreciated staff's informative presentations today and during the Working Group meeting yesterday. As they said during yesterday's meeting, their office has outstanding questions and concerns about the adequacy of certain modelling assumptions. They are, for example, concerned about the accuracy of projections concerning the number of long-term residents in the Tahoe Basin, and the number of overnight visitors to the Tahoe Basin. It is important to their office that they have an opportunity to discuss these and other concerns with TRPA staff after today's meeting, and that TRPA staff retain the ability to adjust the model inputs based on that discussion. As such, they requested that the Board's action today allow for, and includes, direction to staff to work with their office to address these concerns prior to performing the model run. They look forward to continuing their conversations on this matter.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Faustinos made a motion to endorse the proposed regional forecast approach for use in the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan.

Ms. Aldean said based on the comment of the California Attorney General's Office, staff should continue to involve the partners in the region as we move forward to amend the forecasting approach to better reflect current and future conditions.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Berkgigler, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Cashman, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Beyer, Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

- C. Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Program Update: 2019 Achievements and Priorities for Building Future Success

TRPA team member Mr. Zabaglo provided the presentation.

Mr. Zabaglo started by thanking the Governing Board, Senior Leadership, and staff, the previous strategic initiative for Aquatic Invasive Species control funding was an overwhelming success. While there's still more to do, over the past few years they were able to obtain millions of dollars in funding. There was one million from the Army Corps of Engineers, and several million from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act. There are two agreements already in place and in use for approximately six million dollars in funding. They've been notified from the US Fish and Wildlife that they can submit a scope of work for the third agreement that includes a funding appropriation of over four million dollars. Major projects now have a funding source.

Another accomplishment was the development of the AIS Control Action Agenda. This is a bold plan with a significant goal of reductions in AIS over the next ten years. There's still a lot of work

to do but are continuing to demonstrate that AIS work in Lake Tahoe is a worthy investment. The plan is intended to start in 2021 but the planning process for the first five years has already started. The Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinating Committee is building a work plan and budget that forecasts planning, project implementation, and long term monitoring that includes locations identified in the Action Agenda as a tier one highest priority location. Those projects that will benefit from the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act funding are places such as Ski Run Marina and the channel leading from the marina, and the Taylor and Tallac Creeks and marsh system. These are large and complicated infestations and they now have an opportunity to move forward with those.

They're making progress with significant accomplishments for the Tahoe Keys. While this project is complicated at multiple levels, the collaborative process and the work it takes to do that is paying off. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement is in progress and is nearing release. A presentation will be made to the board later this summer on the draft document and the proposed project.

The prevention program has seen no new detections. It's rare to have that kind of success with AIS and this issue. A thank you to the Tahoe Resource Conservation District, the marinas, and ramp operators. To maintain that success, they need to continue the role as leaders both locally and regionally but at the national level as well. That translates to strengthening and expanding partnerships with the federal partners, the legislators, and the boating industry. He and Ms. Regan participated as subject matter experts in a congressional community's panel on AIS issues.

Priorities for prevention in the next year or so are to make permanent stations that will help with the sustainability of the program. That will reduce the yearly strain on resources for site set up, breakdown, moving equipment, obtaining leases, permits, and other agreements. The permanent stations can provide a better level of professionalism, customer service, and efficacy. Stations identified for this is the one on the Nevada side within the State Route 28 corridor management plan. They're working with partners for funding, plan design, and construction to take place in a few years. They're also working with the Tahoe Resource Conservation District and the California Tahoe Conservancy on potentially using asset lands for another permanent inspection station. Funding for the program will continue to be a priority. The Action Agenda identified the need for significant control funds, and they'll need to build on what they've acquired so far. They are working with the Army Corps of Engineers on reauthorizing and perhaps developing new funding for Tahoe and the partnership has been able to leverage the collective funds to implement projects. The projects being implemented this season is continuing the work at Meeks Bay and are finalizing an agreement with the US Forest Service to leverage their respective Lake Tahoe Restoration Act funds for work at the Taylor and Tallac system. They'll be issuing a request for proposal for implementation of that project in the near future. They're also planning for work to be done at Ski Run Marina. Because of the upland inputs and the vast landscape, they're forming an interdisciplinary team that includes TRPA AIS and Stormwater staff, the Tahoe Resource Conservation District staff, the marina ownership group, the City of South Lake Tahoe, and likely Vail Corporation, and others to synergize efforts with a mountain to marina project. It's a complicated system and they'll be seeking input from the science community as well to better understand what's happening and help build a nutrient model that can help form solutions similar to what's being done at the Tahoe Keys.

May 27, 2020

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VII.C-AIS-Program-Update.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 2020 Watercraft Inspection Fee Structure

TRPA team member Mr. Zabaglo provided the presentation.

Mr. Zabaglo said the program relies on funding from both states, grants, and private funds from the boaters in the form of fees.

Given the pandemic, the program has suspended the inspections and until recently launch facilities had also been closed. They've been in frequent communication from the state partners, counties, and launch facility operators to collaborate on decisions to protect the health of the community and Lake Tahoe. While TRPA is not a health agency, they have a role to play given their oversight of the Aquatic Invasive Species program and the vast partnerships at every level of governance including the launch facility operators and the public at large.

A phased approach was agreed upon and is currently being implemented. As of last week, several launch facilities began to open. Some will still need additional time to prepare as this issue has created delays in bringing on staff and preparing themselves to open. Currently, only boats with an intact inspection seal will be able to launch. These are known as the Tahoe Only boat which were last in Lake Tahoe and haven't been in another body of water since last season. These boats don't require an additional inspection before the launch. As conditions change and the situation evolves, they'll evaluate how that effects their ability to open inspection stations and conduct inspections. Presumably travel restrictions to the Basin would need to change in order to conduct inspections for out of town boats. They've received several calls from locals that do need an inspection and solutions have been developed to address that. They'll need to work with the states and counties before they can move into the next phase. In the meantime, they're working with their implementation partner, the Tahoe Resource Conservation District to be prepared. TRPA staff member, Tom Boos has helped lead an effort throughout the west with the western partners at large to develop operational plans for inspections and decontaminations that can implement the Center for Disease Control and Prevention guidelines. They're working on obtaining the personal protection equipment and disinfectant supplies for the inspection stations and training on these protocols will need to be done before opening. He thanked leadership for their guidance and the marina and ramp operators for all of their hard work.

Although, they continue to experience rising costs of the program, given the circumstances they are not proposing a change to the fees at this time. This fall and winter they'll evaluate the

financial impacts this has had on the program and work on a long term financial solution for the program.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VIII.A-2020-Watercraft-Inspection-Fee-Structure.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates said a certain amount of funding for the program comes from both states. By not increasing the fees, are we assuming that we're going to get the same amount from both states?

Mr. Zabaglo said the program uses fees and funds received from the prior year. The fees that are collected this year will support the program next year. We currently have enough fees to operate this season.

Ms. Novasel asked if staff has been in contact with the emergency office services about personal protection equipment.

Mr. Zabaglo said they've been working with multiple agencies, organizations, and marina partnerships to get what is needed.

Mr. Hicks said he's been receiving questions from people who have boats and can't get them on the Lake. He asked what the timing was to get this work done and open everything up.

Mr. Zabaglo said inquiries can be forwarded to staff and people can follow the www.tahoebotinspections.com for information on program and launch facility status. For boats that have the seals intact can go to the website to see what facilities are currently open. There are working with the partners to understand what the implications are of the Governors orders. They're working on the second phase that would perhaps allow some level of inspections for locals.

Mr. Hicks asked if there's a distinction of the orders between California and Nevada that may affect this.

Mr. Zabaglo said on the California side there are still restrictions for out of basin residents to come to the Basin. In Nevada, residents are guided to recreate locally in their own county. They are working with Jim Lawrence with Nevada and Lizzy Williamson with California to ensure there's coordination as they progress through this situation.

Mr. Hicks suggested that the link be accessible through the TRPA website.

Ms. Gustafson said she's been contacted by a number of local people who live in the Basin but take their boats to other lakes. Some of the people with in and out stickers are local and not coming from out of the area.

Mr. Zabaglo said they're working on that as part of the second stage of the phased approach. They do recognize that there's locals that have the in and out stickers and are coordinating with the states and counties to ensure that the plan they've developed can move forward.

Ms. Regan said we've been challenged with the amount of interest that they've had from the community on this. They receive dozens of calls each day and those calls are returned the same day if not the following day. Please let your constituents know that TRPA is happy to discuss this with anyone. There are sliders on the TRPA website that will direct people where to go. We're in phase one that was constructed with the input from both states, counties, and local health officers. Roughly, 90 percent of the Tahoe only stickers are generally locals or people that never leave the Lake. The locals that go in and out of the Lake are about 10 to 15 percent of those in and out stickers. Most of the in and out stickers are visitors which is the rationale for this being in phase two. They're working to bring on the in and out inspections in a safe responsible way when the time is right.

Ms. Aldean said last night the Governor of Nevada will move into phase two of reopening on May 29th which includes aquatic facilities and swimming pools at 50 percent capacity as well as water Parks. People are going to question why they can't get their boat inspected when other recreational facilities will be available to people at a 50 percent capacity.

Mr. Zabaglo said they are following these updates to ensure that there are prepared to take the next step into phase two.

Ms. Aldean said some may logically question the rationale for not allowing boats to be inspected that don't have seals intact. She asked if the concern is with the folks inspecting the boats and their inability to maintain social distancing. What are the criteria to determine when the appropriate time is to allow more than just Tahoe only boats?

Ms. Marchetta said they're aware that Nevada is moving into phase two. They'll now engage with both states because what's most important at Tahoe is that it does not differ across state lines. They'll need to work on dealing with how to get the inspection stations open, getting inspectors hired and trained and engage with law enforcement as needed. In addition, they'll need to ensure that there are protective protocols in place at those inspection locations. It's quite complex working across state lines and multiple jurisdictions.

Ms. Aldean said it may be beneficial to have the Tahoe boating inspection website be more dynamic as these things evolve. If they can anticipate the questions and have answers available on the website so people don't get upset and disgruntled.

Mr. Lawrence commended Mr. Zabaglo, Ms. Regan, TRPA staff, and his counterpart in California, Ms. Williamson for all of the coordination. This has been so dynamic and challenging. They're aware of the newest direction in Nevada. It will take time to come up with the plan for phase two, including the campgrounds statewide and how they manage all their recreation facilities. Their concern is Sand Harbor which is already packed even under today's restriction. If they have launches just open in Nevada, not just the inspection stations, they can't maintain social distancing with all the beach recreation and boat launching at Cave Rock and Sand Harbor if California's not open. It takes a lot of coordination and they're trying to open up their recreation facilities as quickly and safely as possible.

Mrs. Cegavske said people are not willing to wait for us to have plans, we need to have something in place before. It's getting hotter and people are going out to recreate. We can't take this lightly and it's something that was needed yesterday. It's going to happen whether we want it to or not.

GOVERNING BOARD

May 27, 2020

Mr. Yeates says he sympathizes with staff. There's an issue of hiring the people and ensuring that they're protected along with protecting the Lake.

Mrs. Cegavske said she doesn't disagree but is concerned.

Ms. Berkbigler said what they're seeing in the Nevada area of the Lake is that people from California are coming to their area and inundating it. She would like this to be a lake wide introduction and not just the boat ramps on the Nevada side opened when California can't open. In about 90 minutes the Washoe County Sheriff's issued about 22 tickets along Lakeshore Drive in Incline Village for people speeding along that roadway. The proposal to keep it controlled with Tahoe Basin craft only until such time as California's Governor starts to relax the rules is going to be helpful to them.

Ms. Gustafson said California has a ruling that outdoor recreation providers are allowed to operate under the current stage two. Everything is changing so quickly.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said her comments are in no way an indictment of staff. This is one of the Agency's stellar programs. She's not critical of staff but rather critical of the dilemma we find ourselves in. She's not currently a member of the Carson City Board of Supervisors but as a member of the Governing Board she's been receiving calls and emails requesting clarification and is hard for her to give people answers that are satisfactory. To the extent we can address those issues dynamically on the website would be helpful to those board members who are receiving these inquiries.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to Adopt the Proposed Resolution 2020- as provided in Attachment A Approving the 2020 Watercraft Inspection Fee Schedule.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Berkbigler, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Cashman, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

- B. New Multiple-Use Pier, Gilmartin/Akatiff/Telfeian, 8778/8780/8782/8796 Brockway Vista Avenue, Placer County, California, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 090-231-047, 048, 049, 050, TRPA File Number ERSP2019-1326

TRPA team member Ms. Good provided the presentation.

Ms. Good said today's presentation will include review of the key components of the 2018 Shoreline Plan that are relevant to the review of this new multiple-parcel pier. It's also important to highlight the differences between how TRPA use to review piers under the old code and how the 2018 code improved pier review; lending more consistency, transparency, and fairness to the

review and approval of pier projects. Lastly, she'll review the pier project.

The 2018 Shoreline Plan and corresponding Code of Ordinances allows for a total of 128 new piers to be allocated over the life of the plan. New piers are allocated every two years which we are currently in years one and two of implementation. Staff began the process of awarding pier allocations for new piers last year and have issued five allocations for single-parcel piers and seven allocations for multiple-parcel piers. When the Governing Board adopted the shoreline plan, they designated that multiple-parcel piers come to the board for consideration. The board also designated that the single-parcel piers be considered by the Hearings Officer. And all other modifications and expansions to existing piers will continue to be reviewed and approved at staff level.

Pier allocations work much like residential allocations, an allocation isn't the right to build, it's the right to apply. TRPA awarded the allocations based on codified prioritization criteria, developed by the Shoreline Steering Committee during policy development and adopted by the Governing Board as a result of the Shoreline Plan approval. These codified criteria prioritize retiring potential shorezone development and placement of new piers in less sensitive scenic areas. The top seven multiple parcel piers that TRPA awarded allocations to were those that retired the most development potential in less sensitive scenic areas. The proposed pier before the board today was the one that ranked the highest of the ones received.

Reviewing pier projects now is much different than it was prior to 2018. Under the old shoreline code, there were no standards for multiple-parcel piers. A multiple-parcel pier could deviate from the design standards that were assigned to a single-parcel pier, however the extent of deviations allowed was not defined. The absence of these multiple-parcel pier standards created problems for implementation. The new shoreline code includes specific design and location standards that give limits to things such as pier length and width, visible mass, and number of boatlifts, for example. These specific design standards give more consistency and predictability to the review of multiple parcel piers.

The proposed pier serves four primary residential parcels. As such the specific design and development criteria outlined in the Code of Ordinances correspond to a pier serving four primary residential parcels. TRPA has provided design criteria for piers with maximums consistent with achieving and maintaining thresholds and avoiding environmental impacts. Like with height and coverage on upland projects, a property owner may design within the allowable criteria and TRPA doesn't necessarily on case by case basis set lower limits unless there's something to unique about a parcel as to cause an environmental threshold issue.

The proposed pier conforms to codified length, width, number of boat lifts, setbacks, and the total amount of allowed scenic massing and all additional scenic masses mitigated. Development potential will be retired through a Placer County recorded deed restriction and these four parcels will only be allowed this one shared pier amongst them. No other piers will be allowed within this project area. The project is located in feed and cover fish habitat as such will fully mitigate all impacts to the Lake bottom. Adjacent properties will not be impacted by littoral drift due to construction of the pier. As a result of conformance with the specific design and development standards of the Code of Ordinances, staff recommends approval of the findings, and the proposed project subject to the draft permit.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-VIII.B-Multiple-Use-Pier.pdf](#)

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

Larry Pasero said his family owns 8770 Brockway Vista, APN 090-231-031. Whereas, he's not opposed to a new pier installation, but is greatly concerned with the proposed plan and approval process. A fair amount of time has not been allocated for neighboring parties to complete their due diligence regarding this proposal. The following items are concerns that he believes require mitigation. For emphasis, he's not opposed to neighbors building and enjoying a pier. It's his opinion that minor changes to scope and length would help make this a more acceptable project that would complement, instead of degrading, the amazing aesthetic of our north shore. The length of the pier is inconsistent with all other piers located along the shoreline of Brockway Vista. He realizes the pier conditions permit extension to the 6,219 foot datum or to the TRPA pier line, with a requirement to limit length to the shorter value.

The proposal identifies (2) 6,219 foot datum lines as the line splits at the pier location. The proposal utilizes the southernmost 6219 foot datum lines. He believes in the spirit of the requirements, the northernmost 6,219 foot datum line should be used, thus reducing the overall length and visual impact without impacting the ability to serve the 6,219 foot datum. The proposed pier extends beyond the TRPA pier line as currently proposed. This appears to be a clear violation of the planning requirements, as noted, the 6,219 foot datum would be the required data point for length. The proposed pier will dominate and significantly impact the existing neighboring views to the east and is clearly larger and more visually prominent than any of the existing piers. With a proposed length of 362 feet the pier extends farther into the lake, and blocks views to more of the lake surface and surrounding mountains.

Because the proposed pier would block additional views of the lake surface, it would reduce the intactness of scenic views from adjoining neighbor's frontage. Intactness is one of the four criteria used to develop TRPA scenic quality ratings for this scenic resource, and is defined as "the degree to which a landscape retains its natural condition, or the degree to which modifications emphasize or enhance the natural condition of the landscape" (TRPA 1993). This proposal fails to provide emphasis or enhancement and requires additional review. The addition of 4 mechanical boat hoists has not been accounted for in the visual mass calculations. Two 6 ton lifts and two 12 ton lifts, when in use, will add a significant impact to visual mass in the form of boats raised aloft on the hoist. The visual wall created by the boats suspended out of water will reduce the intactness of the view of the lake and mountains to the east. At minimum, the project should study visual mass impacts with renderings from both the shore and from the lake, similar to what was required of the 2016-2017 Kings Beach Pier Rebuild Project Draft EIR/EIS. He has sent his complete comments to Ms. Good.

Jim Robertson, Brockway Vista resident said there was lack of proper notice before staff report on this project. The Notice of May 13 was received by him on May 18, yet the staff report on May 20 said there were no comments from neighbors . So, they only had one or two days to send

GOVERNING BOARD

May 27, 2020

comments? He checked with three other neighbors within 300 ft of the pier and their first notice was also dated May 13. They are Gordon, (8774 Brockway Vista) Bosch (8764 Brockway Vista)and Gannon (8754 Brockway Vista). Despite what the staff report says, this project is not comparable with other existing piers in the area. Did anyone from TRPA ever physically inspect this area? The visual mass of the pier alone is upwards of 3,300 square feet. Add to that 4 boats approximately 10 ft in height and there will be a huge visual mass. There is no need for a 15 ft wide section extending 75 ft at the end of the pier to simply get on and off the boats, eight feet should be plenty. Finally, he has no objection to a pier being built. It is the size and incompatibility to the rest of the area that he objects to.

Darin Bosch, owner of 8764 Brockway Vista Avenue, adjacent to the proposed multi-parcel pier development. His property is less than 150' from the proposed pier. He received no notice of any kind concerning the pier project and the first he even heard of this pier was late afternoon on Memorial Day. He has no objection to a pier. However, he absolutely needs time to review and discuss this project and hasn't been granted any time. Please postpone action on this project for at least 30 days.

Eileen Blesio said she understands there is a hearing today to discuss the approval of a multiple-use pier located off Brockway Vista Avenue, Kings Beach, California. She received the letter describing the project because she is Mr. Akatiff's adjacent neighbor to the south. She has no objection to this project. She believes that the pier will be built complying to the strictest standards of the TRPA. Thank you for being such a dedicated advocate for keeping our jewel of a lake clean and uncluttered.

Stephen Gordon owner of 8774 Brockway Vista Avenue directly adjacent to and 43 feet from the proposed Gilmartin, Telfeian, and Akatiff multi-parcel pier. He appreciated the opportunity to share his comments with the TRPA Governing Board. As he communicated to TRPA's principal planner for this project, he doesn't object to a pier being constructed to serve these parcels. Adjacent property owners Jim Robertson and Darin Bosch do not object to a pier either. He does however have significant concerns about the size of the proposed pier, the design resulting in over 3,200 square feet of decked surface. Loaded with boats on either side of the 15 foot pier head will result in a massive 35' x 75' displacement and loaded structure. Without boats the proposed pier head's 1,125 square feet of decked surface presents an ideal surface for gatherings which Mr. Gordon presumes is not what TRPA believes the intended use is and which will likely result in significant impact to neighboring properties. He has concerns about a host of other issues and as an advocate for the lake and due to the significance of the proposed pier, He believes it's absolutely fair that he and his neighbors adequate time to review, and doing so potentially with informed assistance. He respectfully asked the Governing Board to postpone action on this project for at least 30 days.

Mark Gilmartin said he is part of the group applying for a multi-use pier under TRPA File # ERSP2019-1326. This is his rebuttal to the opposition to our pier application. It may also be worthy to note that our group was selected to pursue a pier permit in 2009 prior to the lawsuits that halted the implementation of the 2009 Shorezone Ordinances and therefore our pier application. Those lawsuits indirectly cost us tens of thousands of unrecoverable dollars that they have once again expended towards this application.

It's been a long wait since 2009 for this current opportunity, and as we did in 2009, four neighbors

have band together in the spirit of the new Shorezone Ordinances to design a multi-use pier within the new development standards.

As expressed by staff, their pier design conforms with each and every development standard contained within the Shorezone Ordinances. He would like to remind you that every agency, league, group, committee, you name it in the Tahoe Basin and beyond has collaborated for the past ten plus years to define these ordinances. The opposition has literally had dozens of opportunities to attend public meetings and express their concerns regarding the length, width, or lighting of a pier. He knows because he attended many of them himself and Mr. Gordon should know because he is on the board of the League to Save Lake Tahoe which diligently participated in this collaboration and approved the adoption of these ordinances. Yet now, at the 11th hour, already having a pier of their own, the opposition hires an attorney and are complaining about the length, width, and lighting of our proposed pier along with Mr. Akatiff's jet ski lift without any regard to the fact each and every specification is within the ordinances approved by Mr. Gordon's own organization!

To address their complaints directly, the length of their pier is necessary to reach navigable waters of 30 feet past 6,219 plus the 15 feet allowed to accommodate for more than three parcel shared use, 80 percent of their pier is 8 feet wide which is actually 7 feet narrower than allowed by the code, the lighting meets all design specifications and will be on a timer, and Mr. Akatiff's lift is being completely removed from the lake as part of this application. It is for these reasons, that you must vote to approve their pier as designed today and uphold the ten plus years of hard work of all the agencies, groups, organizations and committees in the Tahoe Basin which worked so tirelessly to define the future of the Lake Tahoe Shorezone.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates asked when the notice was sent out.

Ms. Good said the notice was sent out on May 13, two weeks prior to the hearing. That's standard noticing for projects that go to the Governing Board or Hearings Officer.

Mr. Yeates asked if the reason the proposed pier extends beyond the pier line is because it's a multi-use pier.

Ms. Good said yes, that's correct. The survey provided by the applicant collaborated with TRPA's mapped data for both 6,219 feet and the pier headline. It conforms with the giving the additional length because it serves more than three residential parcels.

Mr. Yeates said the staff report stated it didn't have the scenic impact but there's public comment today about it blocking views, especially when the boat hoist is raised with boats on them.

Ms. Good said for scenic massing and scenic mitigation it's important to dissect that. There are two primary criteria that staff looks at for scenic massing. They look at the allowed scenic massing and is prescribed at 520 square feet for piers serving this many parcels. What that allowed massing encompasses are any structural components of the pier, not including boats on a boat lift or accessory structures such as handrails, ladders for example. This is approximately 462 square feet towards the allowable mass. They require mitigation based on the pier in total; all of the mass

that's going to be created by boat lifts, boats on boat lifts, and all the accessory structures. That number doesn't necessarily count towards the allowable but does have to be mitigated and that is mitigated at a ratio of 1:2 on the upland properties. They look at the pier from the Lake and the scenic roadway units, not having to do with scenic massing but rather the scenic impact of the pier. They look at impacts from specific identified scenic resource points within the shoreline or roadway unit. Because of the way the shoreline works in this area there are other piers on either side that are not quite as long as this one. Although the homeowner's association pier to the south is almost as long as this and fits relatively in line with the piers along this area of shoreline.

Mr. Marshall said for an example, staff went through a rigorous scenic evaluation of the development capacity that the Lake could absorb from multiple-use, single-use piers, buoys, etc. when the shoreline plan was adopted in 2018. They looked at the capacity of the Lake to determine whether or not these structures can be built without impacting the threshold values. The answer is yes. The examination here is more limited to whether any particular unique impacts associated with this project. That wasn't taken into account for the programmatic environmental impact statement they did on the entire program. That's why staff uses the process Ms. Good has outlined. It fits within what was analyzed in the Shoreline Plan Environmental Impact Statement. Therefore, if it meets all the standard criteria and we're not seeing any unexpected environmental impact and is why we feel it's appropriate to move forward with this pier.

Mr. Yeates said it appears that it's the visual mass at the end of the pier. He asked if it was correct that we're mitigating that by reducing scenic impacts on the shore, not necessarily from the Lake.

Ms. Good said we're mitigating scenic impacts on the shore by screening upland structures, for example with vegetation, changing colors of materials so they are less impactful as viewed from the Lake.

Ms. Aldean referred to her correspondence with Ms. Good regarding a comment made in a letter by Mr. Gordon about the free standing jet ski lift. Staff's response stated that as part of the application even though it's grandfathered in, it can't be retained because they're converting it to a conforming boat lift. She asked if that condition is in the permit or is it implied by code.

Ms. Good said it's implied by code and also the final breakdown of mooring structures that are associated with each property. It doesn't say that it will explicitly be removed but it's in the breakdown for the mooring structures per property.

Ms. Aldean said it still appears on the site overview. There's nothing noting the elimination of the lift but only a reference to rotating it so it's perpendicular to the dock.

Ms. Good said yes, the structure will be removed and will not appear on the site plan that TRPA would approve if the project is approved.

Mr. Cashman said 345 feet seems long for a pier in that area. He would assume the length is to get the lifts out to a specific bottom elevation.

Ms. Good said there's an interest on the applicant side to extend the pier to dependably serviceable depth. The Code of Ordinances allows for the length that they desire which is 6,219 feet plus a certain amount beyond that because it serves four primary residential parcels. They've

GOVERNING BOARD

May 27, 2020

taken it to the maximum length that's allowed in the code and what they feel is necessary for serviceability.

Mr. Marshall said the way that the incentive system was set up for one of the key policies was to promote multiple-use piers and multi-parcel piers serving multiple residences. This is the type of pier that they want to promote, and part of that incentive was if there were four parcels together that it would get an increase in length to get to a deeper depth. All of these were negotiated in a lot of detail through the Shoreline Plan process and then debated and adopted by the Governing Board. It does have to do with getting to navigable depth and then an extra bonus because of the number of parcels involved.

Mr. Hicks said if he's correct, this pier is going to be located in the same bay as the North Tahoe Events Center community pier. The water is shallow in that area and a pier would have to go out quite a ways to make it functional. There was a lot of work and effort put into the Shoreline Plan. Since this is the first one to come forward with the new Shoreline Plan and it meets all of the criteria, he encouraged the board to give a favorable vote. It sends a good message to the people who have been waiting many years for these new standards. With that said, we've seen it before where neighbors of these developments are concerned. It's a tough call because you need to respect their views and concerns. The standards on this pier have been carefully designed and met.

Ms. Gustafson said she also had a question on the public noticing, and it appears that all standard procedures were followed. There was a huge amount of time that went into this process and while the neighbors are concerned and it's a change in their community, this has been a long time process for TRPA. She upholds all the work that's gone into this process to get to the system and standards that were arrived at. This pier does meet all of those standards for the criteria that was set through the working groups and she too will support this project.

Ms. Gustafson made a motion to approve the required findings in Attachment A, including a finding of no significant effect.

Mr. Yeates said he was looking forward to this project because it was a multi-use project and is what we wanted to encourage as part of the new Shoreline Plan. He's sympathetic to the opposition but the reason we have a better plan is we spent the time with the committee that did this work so that we as a Governing Board don't have to make our own individual judgments each time we have a pier before us. This pier has conformed with the requirements and supported the motion.

Ms. Aldean said the Shoreline Review Committee that consisted of all the various agencies that have jurisdiction along the shoreline get together to review these applications. In the staff report it states that the California State Lands Commission and the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife had no comment because they hadn't received applications for this pier independently of the proposed project. She asked if they were precluded from making comments.

Ms. Good said staff has since brought that back to the Shoreline Review Committee and all of the agencies have acted and approved it with the exception of the California State Lands Commission which are bringing it to their commission in August for approval. They wanted to see TRPA's

approval prior to taking action.

Mrs. Cegavske said she's going to vote in favor of the proposed pier, reluctantly. She's not in favor of there being differences and feels that this does do that. There are those that have put in those application years ago and might have gone a little too far with what they've expected. She'll vote in favor but has reservations about this. Staff did an excellent job on what they could do with this but is concerned that there were people who came forward and are opposed to this.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Berkgigler, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Cashman, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

Ms. Gustafson made a motion to approve the proposed project subject to the conditions in the draft permit in Attachment B.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Berkgigler, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Cashman, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

IX. APPEAL

- A. Appeal of Approval of Lot Line Adjustment Permit, 460, 470, & 480 Gonowabie Road, Washoe County, Nevada, APNs 123-131-04, -05, & -06, Appeal File Numbers LLAD2019-0821 & ADMIN2020-002

Mr. Marshall said this morning the Legal Committee heard the appeal item with presentations from both the appellant and the permittee, underlying property owner, Gonowabie, LLC. There were many questions and a good discussion. The outcome was that the committee recommended that the Governing Board continue this item until the June Governing Board meeting. This time will be used to gain additional information on two items. If the board is familiar with the packet there's parcel number three that has a pullout that the community uses. There were significant questions as to the ownership and use of that section of the right-of-way adjacent to parcel three. The second item was that there was significant conversation about the ability of TRPA to even consider a lot line adjustment give the fact that come of the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions were incorporated into a judgment and into various deeds. And whether or not that precludes the agency from entertaining a lot line adjustment. Some members of the committee were interested in having additional briefing on the legal ability of TRPA to adopt changed lot lines in this particular context. An additional period of time will allow the Washoe County representative for the board to consult with her local citizens advisory board to determine when they heard this item, what their action was and the reasons for that. The committee recommended and staff concurs, as well as the appellant and Gonowabie, LLC, all recommend that the Governing Board continue this item to the June board meeting.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Yeates said it's the recommendation of the Legal Committee that this item be continued to the June Governing Board meeting. This will allow the time to address the two questions that were raised and also the opportunity for Commissioner Berkbigler to check in with her local committee as to why they were opposed to this project.

Mr. Bruce said so moved.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Berkbigler, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Cashman, Mrs. Cegavske, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Novasel, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Mr. Rice

Motion carried.

X. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Marchetta said Lake Tahoe West scoping period on the large landscape forest health project on the West Shore has been extended for a couple of weeks. During that scoping they received a couple of action alerts from different advocacy groups addressing a Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Plan amendment issue regarding roads in designated back country areas. That forest plan amendment is not something that TRPA will or has to approve. A few Governing Board members have reached out to staff to better understand what that issue is about. Staff will offer some early advanced briefings to board members on that issue or anything else related to Lake Tahoe West.

1) Update on the Environmental Scholarship program

Ms. Ortiz said this summer many high school seniors are transitioning to next phase of life without the traditional fanfare of graduations and award ceremonies. TRPA is celebrating two local seniors selected to receive the environmental education scholarship. TRPA created the environmental scholarship fund in 2004 that awards scholarships to Lake Tahoe seniors pursuing environmental careers. Since its inception, 25 students have been awarded a total of \$10,950.00. Scholarships are based on academic merit and the desire to pursue a career in the environmental field. A special thank you goes to Governing Board member Ms. Faustinos and TRPA team member Ms. McIntyre who reviewed all of the applications to help select this year's recipients. This year two impressive students were each awarded \$500 scholarships; Logan Chapman and Maxx Emami.

Logan Chapman of South Tahoe High School has showed an impressive commitment to the environment and giving back to his community since elementary school. As founder and President of his school's climate crew, his collaboration with the Lake Tahoe Unified School Board led to the purchase of three electric school buses, improved the district's food menus through reduced meat consumption, and promoted a climate science curriculum. He's represented the youth perspective

GOVERNING BOARD

May 27, 2020

before city council to help develop the South Lake Tahoe Climate Action Plan and contributed to micro plastic research with the University of California, Davis and the Tahoe Environmental Research Center as part of his senior project. Logan will be pursuing an environmental engineering degree at UCLA.

Maxx Emami of North Tahoe High School stood out to the selection committee because of her ability to juggle two jobs, a myriad of volunteer opportunities, and an extraordinary family dynamic while maintaining a stellar academic record. Her passion for animals is reflected in her role as a horse trainer at the Reno Equestrian Center and as a volunteer at the human society. Maxx will be the first in her family to attend college and has been saving for school while working as a clerk at Save Mart. She plans to work towards a degree in sustainable agriculture.

Funding for the scholarship comes from generous TRPA staff, Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission member contributions as well as donations from Bike the West and America's Most Beautiful Bike Ride.

Board Comments & Questions

Mr. Bruce thanked Ms. Ortiz for all of her work on this program and to everyone that contributed. We need leadership in this area, and this is exciting to see these kids take off in very difficult situation.

B. General Counsel Status Report

No report.

XI. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Yeates said he participated in his first meeting as a board member of the Tahoe Transportation District and also had the opportunity to listen in on their Governance Committee meeting. He came away with a sense that a few of them have been spending a lot time on transportation and a number of them that may not have a full understanding of what might be going on or don't appreciate TRPA's role. It's a real opportunity to get together through the boards themselves to begin to understand the jurisdictions. He said we are so unique, but you could compare it to the west side with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). All the counties that make up that entity are the ones who do the federal transportation management work, who also did the sustainable communities strategy work, and the blueprint work for the counties. SACOG has no regulatory authority where TRPA not only has regulatory authority but has bi-state regulatory authority and was created by Congress and two states.

There's a lot that TRPA is dealing with but there's a balance between our policy making and the implementation through the Transportation District. Sometimes, those have overlapped. They certainly overlapped on One Tahoe because whenever you propose a major funding proposal, that has policy implications. He's never seen the California Legislature deal with a major funding issue and not deal with policy. He feels that it would be worthwhile that we are on the same page to get some transportation improvement projects online. Despite the terrible fiscal conditions, we face today, there's opportunity with approved projects to enhance transportation and corridor plans that are being launched to have them ready if there's funding at the back end of Covid. The bi-

state process is one way for us to try and emphasize the support we need from the two states to help carry out some of these projects we have placed a high priority on.

Ms. Gustafson said Placer County has received their stage two variances from the Governor's process to move forward with reopening more businesses in the County with safety protocols in place. Yesterday, their board met in a special session to consider other items which one was adopting a resolution to send to the Governor requesting that they get to a reopening of tourism lodging in the rural communities as well as some of their other stage three businesses like gyms and salons. While the meeting was taking place, the Governor was already starting to announce the openings of barber shops and salons. They continue to be concerned because they know people are coming to Lake Tahoe and eastern Placer County to recreate. They're seeing more instances of illegal camping, back country camping and would prefer to get them in controlled circumstances to educate them on safe practices while visiting the region. About 51 percent of the transient occupancy tax revenue comes from June through Labor Day weekend. The second item they took action on was a urgency ordinance to allow the restaurants and retailers to expand out of their current footprint onto sidewalks and parking areas to keep the same capacity of their restaurant or retail but be able to spread it into the outdoors so they can continue to have a viable business. Summer is the reliable time for these businesses, it generates over 50 percent of their revenues for the year and in some years, it can be as much as 80 to 90 percent depending on the snowpack. They've also been pursuing clarification on outdoor recreation for kayak and bike rentals, and other types of services used by both second homeowners and visitors.

Ms. Laine asked if Placer County discussed the use of face mask as either a requirement or strong recommendation.

Ms. Gustafson said Placer County didn't, but she did. The North Lake Tahoe business community strongly supports requiring face masks. They are exploring the option to see if their health officer is willing to order masks for the region versus county wide. The dynamics of the county and the population base in the Roseville and Rocklin area and the politics are such that people don't want masks to be required in other parts of the county. She's trying to represent her constituents at the Lake that do want to require masks when someone cannot physically distance from others.

Ms. Laine suggested that they have a discussion about looking similar basin wide. It would be a good message if they had an agreement in the basin that they would require or strongly recommend masks.

Ms. Gustafson said they can talk offline to see if they can set that up.

Ms. Berkbigler said she receives comments from both sides, some would like to require the use of masks and others don't. She questioned how this will be enforced. Washoe County doesn't have extra sheriff deputies to monitor this. The Incline Village General Improvement District is probably in the same situation of having staff with the time to monitor their beaches. She requested of her commission and staff that they look at the possibility of requiring people who enter a grocery store or pharmacy to wear a mask and have it enforced by the grocery store and pharmacy. Even that becomes somewhat complex, because people can be disrespectful when approached about wearing a mask or even handling food in the stores. She doesn't want to see a basin wide requirement because frankly even California citizens are not living up to it. If you drive around the Lake, you'll see less than 50 percent of people wearing masks. Her neighborhood is the second

highest number of Covid cases in Washoe County and there's less than ten percent of people wearing masks.

Ms. Laine said it is difficult to require and no one has the bandwidth to enforce. If they could get the chambers, small business, and some of the large corporations behind it to help enforce.

Ms. Novasel said they've had similar conversations in El Dorado County about how to reopen safely. The reopening guidelines come from the Governor's order. Unless you bring out the National Guard, it's not enforceable, it's an order. The County is not enforcing it per se, they don't do that with any of their regulations at this point when it comes to Covid but they're asking people to be responsible. Again, the non-travel restriction is from the Governor. They have a similar order that they're going to be rescinding as far as traveling but that doesn't mean that they won't have that travel order in place. She's interested in having an offline conversation with the other local jurisdictions about how to address safety around the Lake. El Dorado County has been fortunate with no deaths and no one is hospitalized at this point. She thanked Mr. Yeates for the conversation about transportation and housing and how that fits in. She's hopeful that they can do a caucus in the future to discuss transportation and housing and to move forward in a collaborative way.

XII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Main Street Management Plan and other components of the US 50 South Shore Community Revitalization Project

Mr. Hester said when staff brought forward the work plan, there was a phase three where they were going to work on changes to the Code of Ordinances that might be needed to implement the Main Street Plan. One that was identified was changing the commercial floor area requirement for outdoor dining. Covid has brought that forward sooner than planned. While they're waiting for the parking management study and some other aspects of the Main Street Plan to be finished, they've been requested to look into allowing restaurants to have more outdoor dining to be able to be economically viable while social distancing. Staff has issued some interim guidance and staff is working on phase three for outdoor dining and commercial floor area requirements.

B. Local Government & Housing Committee

Ms. Novasel there's the possibility they'll meet in the next month or two.

C. Legal Committee

No report.

D. Operations & Governance Committee

Ms. Aldean said they're continuing to work with Heritage Bank, bond attorney's, and the financial advisor to complete the required paperwork on the bond refinancing. The plan is to close the deal by June 16 and then retire the old 2007 debt the following week.

E. Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee

Mr. Cashman said they're continuing to work on the Regional Transportation Plan Update.

F. Forest Health and Wildfire Committee

Mr. Hicks said the committee met today and are working through the Code of Ordinances on some forest health code amendments and bringing consistency into the language. They'll be bringing proposed amendments to Section 61.3 to the board in the next month or two. Some of their discussion today was on standardizing the diameter of old growth trees for purposes of measuring them for removal and other reasons. They're also looking at improvements that can be done in the stream environment zones.

G. Regional Plan Implementation Committee

Mr. Yeates said a proposed amendment for the Bijou/Al Tahoe Boys and Girls Club will be heard in June, the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan Amendment in July, and the City of South Lake Tahoe's Tourist Core Area Plan Beach Retreat Amendment in August.

XIII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Lynne Paulson expressed concern about TRPA potentially rushing through the public process for the upcoming project entitled: Tahoe Keys Lagoons Aquatic Weed Control Method Test. The Notice of Preparation for this project indicates there will be an attempt to seek exemption from the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board which prohibits the use of aquatic herbicides in the Keys. This exemption would be sought before other non-chemical methods of weed control have been thoroughly examined and tested. With the global pandemic, extra care must be taken to engage the public whom you represent, not only from California and Nevada, but also a broader population since Lake Tahoe is of national significance. If this meeting is any example, my concerns are heightened by the separation I feel from direct contact with you. For at least half a century, technology has existed to use operators to allow the public to directly speak at public conference calls. Why are you using new technology to add a separate layer of distance between the Board and the public? It is most disappointing to not be able to face you in person, but I understand that current restriction. What I do not understand is your elimination of direct public speech during this meeting. This is a grievous error. Your meeting information said there will be safe and effective options for public input available at public meetings. I do not consider it effective for anyone else to read my comments. Your process of public engagement must be robust and inclusive, and this is not. You should take extra measures to accommodate public input during these difficult times. That should include the ability for the public to speak directly to the Board and also include extending the time for review of projects. This would allow full discussion and public input on important matters such as the proposed plan to use potentially harmful aquatic herbicides in the Tahoe Keys. Please add an agenda item to your next Board meeting to address these issues surrounding public input during the Covid-19 restrictions.

Dr. Adams made a comment through this form at last month's meeting which was ignored and omitted from the recently published minutes. You would not have been able to pull this stunt had I been able to directly speak behind the podium in person. Please retroactively add my reasonable comment to last month's record and include this follow-up in this meeting's record. My comment

May 27, 2020

was as follows: I am expressing grave concern about the development along the Pioneer Trail TRPA scenic corridor. This will make it exceedingly difficult improve the visual character of this corridor or for it to make its required threshold findings. This scenic corridor should be converted into a scenic parkway. The tree removal will certainly adversely affect this scenic drive. This parcel should be preserved as a park. There are other innovative ways to accomplish affordable housing objectives other than to develop here. You need to perform an environmental "alternatives analysis" that includes rent control, former vacation home rental unit acquisition and conversion to dorm/frat/family style affordable housing, and combinations thereof. Greedy titans of our local tourist industry would like you to build cheap housing for their employees rather than them pay these employees higher salaries under the resulting labor market force shortage. Moreover, most of the culpable managers and players (Tahoe Prosperity Center board included) own multiple homes themselves in the basin and hence directly contribute to the very homeowner shortage issue, and resultant real estate price hikes, they are tasked with "solving" by more development. This is wrong and unethical.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said the Coronavirus has certainly disrupted a great deal of our lives, and the TRPA has, as have many government agencies, adopted new technology in order to continue meetings, but without the public in attendance, due to the potential infections that result from a crowded audience. However, this requires a decision as to what is of importance to the Governing Board, and it appears that Public Participation is of least importance and has been scheduled at the end of the meeting, at an unannounced time. The Tahoe Area Sierra Club Group is very concerned with this treatment of the public as your board enters the upcoming, currently scheduled in June, presentation of the Tahoe Keys Herbicide Test. The Herbicide Test itself is fraught with substantial issues and only the barest information is currently available, in the form of an Notice of Preparation released in June/July of 2019. The single meeting of the Stakeholders that includes the third "circle" of stakeholders, released new information on the status of the lagoons in terms of nutrient production. It was a short meeting, about two hours, and that is the first and last meeting for third level stakeholders as to facts that have been distributed and discussed by the first and second "circles" of stakeholders. In other words, there has been very little public participation available since the Notice of Preparation was released in the summer of 2019. The TRPA's new version of Public Participation is of utmost concern as it both limits the public role to providing a written, and short, statement which is then read by a non-participant, lacking the passion and fervor of real live public presenters. In order to comply with the intent of Public Participation, in this case of significant interest to the United States public, the use of toxic herbicides in the Tahoe Keys and potential impact on Lake Tahoe, they request that the Test project schedule be extended to the time that the virus no longer limits Public Participation in such a severe manner, and the process is both honored and respected by the Governing Board.

Mr. Rowell said I am from New England and have been a lover of Lake Tahoe my entire life; our national treasure, that is ostensibly protected by your congressionally created bi-state compact. I am outraged how the TRPA is abusing the pandemic: creating closed meetings to aggrandize power, with the payoff being the censoring and expunging unfavorable public comments from the record. I experienced such an occurrence last week. It appears that when John Marshall finds a comment that is damaging to the passage or legal standing of a meeting agenda item, he finds a pretext to censor and remove the comment from the record. The first iteration of this was to move these comments to the end of the meeting, and then never read or enter them purporting "lack of time." In the next iteration of this, he absurdly and arbitrarily performed internet name searches of the commenter, looking for a name collision with a deceased person, and then used

the results as "proof" that the person must be "crossing-over" from the dead. These are the tactics of despotic banana republics, not federally created agencies. Let there be no doubt what is occurring; the probability of ""name sharing"" is extremely high, if not certain (Cf. The "Birthday Paradox"). In fact, most individuals on the TRPA share the name of a person of searchable current or historical significance; it is a trivial game to play, even with narrow attribute specificity, say photography (Jeff Cowen is a very famous American photographer). When you include the names of all the people who have ever lived on earth in the last four-thousand years, there is a near-guaranteed historical name collision with a deceased person for nearly every conceivable name a living person might currently have. I was unlawfully censored by this machination last week, and I demand that my submitted (Google Docs) comments be added to the record for the "Tourist Core Area Plan, Pioneer/Ski Run Plan Area Statement 092 and Lakeview Heights Area Plan Statement 085 Boundary Line Amendments." I go by the name is Galen Rowell; I am alive and well and am not a deceased photographer. April 22, 2020 public comment made on Agenda Item No. VIII.B: "I am expressing grave concern about the development along the Pioneer Trail TRPA scenic corridor. This will make it exceedingly difficult improve the visual character of this corridor or for TRPA to make its required threshold findings. This scenic corridor should be converted into a scenic parkway. The tree removal and high density housing will certainly adversely affect this scenic drive. This parcel should be preserved as a park."

Tobi Tyler, Tahoe Area Group and the Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club, I'd like to express our dismay and concern about your decision to proceed as scheduled with the controversial Tahoe Keys Weeds Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement during this pandemic despite the extremely diminished public review process. If this meeting is any example, this process is completely inadequate to meet the intent and requirements of National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act. In a letter dated April 28, 2020, we urged TRPA and Lahontan Water Board to delay the Tahoe Keys Weeds EIR/EIS until a process can be developed that ensures that the meetings and workshops during the comment period can be conducted as the law intends. The hallmark of any public environmental review process is the ability of the public, residents and experts alike to examine, gather, discuss and comment thoughtfully on the complex scientific issues presented in the impact documents. Curbing the growth and spread of invasive weeds in the Tahoe Keys is an important project. But at the moment, it is not so essential and urgent that the environmental review process must continue at the current rapid pace pursued by the Water Board and TRPA staff during this existing public health crisis. It just isn't realistic to hold adequate meetings on the draft materials between June and August. Attendance assuredly will be required to be limited and telepresence options will further reduce participation. Furthermore, experts, scientists, attorneys and academics for example, with very detailed and specific comments are enduring the same challenges the rest of the world is dealing with in terms of employment interruption, family demands and health concerns. To open and close a public comment period when the public is preoccupied with issues of life and death would unfairly limit the participation of many people who have engaged on this issue for many years. We urge you to direct staff to slow this process down.

Kermit Beahan said all of your considerations of wireless telecommunication facilities (WTF's) need environmental assessments, reviews and/or impact statements evaluating their consequences on the endangered Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog: it is known to science that tadpoles placed in tanks at a distance of 140 meters from four cell tower base stations for two months will develop low coordination of movements, an asynchronous growth, in both big and small tadpoles, and a high mortality of 90 percent. Exposed frog tadpoles (*Rana temporaria*)

developed under electromagnetic field (50 Hz, 260 A/m) show an increase in mortality. Exposed tadpoles developed more slowly and less synchronously than control tadpoles and remained at the early stages for longer. Tadpoles developed allergies and EMF caused changes in their blood counts (Grefner et al., 1998). Electromagnetic pollution (in the microwave and radiofrequency range) along with other environmental factors is a possible cause for decline and deformations of some wild amphibian populations exposed. Tadpoles that live near such facilities, exposed to relatively low levels of environmental electromagnetic fields (1.8–3.5V/m) may suffer adverse effects (low coordination of movements, asynchronous growth, and high mortality), and this may be a cause (together with other environmental factors) of decline of amphibian populations (See attached “Mobile Phone Mast Effects on Common Frog (*Rana temporaria*) Tadpoles: The City Turned into a Laboratory” at page 34.

Clearly, cell tower installation near frog habitat may affect frog mortality. As an endangered frog clearly may be affected (50 CFR § 17.11(h); 50 CFR § 17.95(d); 79 FR 24255.), a moratorium must be implemented until the harms to this species is understood and an environmental assessment and/or impact statements is made. Whereas the cited study “concludes that RF emissions ‘may’ cause an increase in development and mortality,” an activity that “may” cause significant environmental effects is precisely what requires an EA (see 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(5); Cf. *Sierra Club v. Norton* (friends of the Earth, Inc.), 207 F.Supp.2d 1310, 1336 (S.D.Ala. 2002) (“Under NEPA, it cannot use the lack of existing information as a basis for acting without preparing an EIS.”))

Thomaz said there are currently some vocal special interest groups, the Tahoe Prosperity Center, Lake Tahoe Visitor's Authority, and Tahoe Beach Club inclusive pressuring local government authorities to streamline cell tower approval. They myopically claim that rapid cell tower deployments are necessary under the banner of “prosperity.” They ignorantly and incorrectly profess to the public that there is no evidence that cell towers have any adverse effect on environmental quality. Despite being presented with thousands of pages of science, they dishonestly continue with the exact same narrative.

Congress created the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency in order to protect a threatened “National Treasure.” The basin was being assaulted by short-term economic interests that ultimately endangered its long-term future, these included a hideous Emerald Bay bridge, beach high-rises, alpine wetlands development, and other development attempts that would strip away the very character that makes Tahoe a treasure. The current cell tower deployments are a new chapter in this very tired story. They threaten to strip away the scenic and wild character of the basin. Radiofrequency radiation kills-off pollinating insects, which in-turn lowers the yield of alpine berries and seeds, which then diminishes the renewable food supply, and hence the populations of birds and mammals. The low-intensity radiofrequency radiation also stresses migratory birds. Furthermore, hundreds of thousands of tourists are drawn to the Tahoe basin to see its unique wildlife populations, and urbanization would significantly diminish this appeal, causing economic harm. Cell towers also diminish real estate values. Because the continued installation of cell towers is a threat to the long-term prosperity of the basin, I plead that you implement a moratorium on cell towers until the long-term impacts are understood.

Ira Einhorn said concerns raised by local special interest groups that we “will all die” in a freak inferno unless there is a rapid deployment in cell towers are unfounded conjecture and baseless speculation. There is no hard evidence whatsoever supporting the certain likelihood of a historically extremely rare scenario; or such event resulting in a mass-casualty. The canyon gorge

May 27, 2020

topography, vegetation, and associated "Venturi Effect" fire weather in Paradise, CA is actually quite different than that surrounding our alpine lakeside cities. Many people died in the "Camp Fire" because the roadways did not have the capacity to evacuate trapped people. Cellphones have actually created stampedes in a wide variety of emergencies.

Groups exploiting this tragedy, such as the Tahoe Prosperity Center ought to be ashamed! I have firsthand knowledge that close relatives of victims of this tragedy are generally angry how their loss has been used statewide to sell all sorts of things, including political decisions that the victims certainly would not have supported if they were alive.

Cell towers are neither the only way nor the best way to provide network connectivity to residents. Cell towers transfer real costs to the environment. Science proves that cell towers damage trees at the cellular level, triggering stress responses. Conifers secrete extremely flammable terpenes--possibly to ward off typical beetle infestations in response from stress caused at the cellular level, in this case because of RF radiation. This actually raises fire danger.

Furthermore, the pulsed microwave radiation used by 4G/5G cell towers is known to cause extremely adverse neuropsychiatric effects including depression and several well documented suicides. It is just as likely or perhaps unfounded as a mass-casualty conflagration that these towers could be the proximate cause of a mass-shooting: known RF-induced depression such as in that in future teenager could cause him or her to act out in violence at school or a public event. We need a moratorium on cell towers and decisions based on current science, not speculation off freak disasters.

Gaylord Nelson said TRPA needs to implement a moratorium on wireless telecommunications facilities (WTF's) deployments, until it is able to assess the serious degree that such installations are undermining its own climate change policies. Cellular broadband is one of the most energy inefficient means of information transmission imaginable. Energy is radiated in a wide range of directions such as to send an adequate signal to just a single point. The energy effectively lost through the air is tremendous. Furthermore, these towers and phones constantly "ping" the each other with idle chatter just to be able to connect a call.

The greenhouse gas emissions associated with continuously running a macro cell tower transmitter with 47,090 watts of effective radiative power (or 187.2 kilowatt-hours per day) is a sizeable fraction per day of the power a household will use in an entire month! The agency policy is to reduce net power consumption, and there needs to be analysis on the impact against the agencies energy consumption goal and policy.

The new 5G frequencies increase the data capacity because the signals travel a much shorter range and thus limit inter-tower interference. However, the very reason this frequency band's range is limited is because the energy is lost heating up the air! We just phased out incandescent lightbulbs because of thermal and electrical waste, and now we are asked to adopt kilowatt microwave transmitters! This is all being done to make some greedy corporate giants milking a bad technology even wealthier, at the complete loss of the environment. 5G transmitters create thermal islands around each site, which also have an obvious potential for environmental harm.

When you compare cellular to fiber optics, the waste is dramatic: a milliwatt laser diode can continuously send broadband signals tens of miles through a single fiber optic strand, whereas it

would take a 50,000 watt transmitter to send this same signal to the same point through the air. The disadvantage of fiber optic terminals being spatially fixed is not an issue for home broadband, because houses do not get up and move around. Setting-up a cellular infrastructure to provide home broadband is horrible public policy. The obvious answer is fiber-to-the-home; and compact home Wi-Fi networks are always an option for those who must have Wi-Fi calling available to their "smart" phone.

Such extremely wasteful uses of energy are responsible for global warming. This is resulting in one of the larger mass-extinction events in geologic history. In this context, the policy choice is easy. Do not permit this waste! TRPA needs a moratorium on Cell Towers while it assesses the impacts.

Concerned Citizens of the Tahoe Basin said they need a moratorium on cell tower installations until the TRPA develops its own threshold findings specific to the sensitive Lake Tahoe alpine environment. Arbitrary cell tower installations add uncertainty to real estate values, cost homeowner equity, unexpectedly ruin a family's nest egg, and generate large health expenses that we all pay for one way or another. A single cancer treatment regimen costs between \$100,000 and \$1 million and human life, itself, is invaluable. Even small risks which result in grave consequences must be taken very seriously. Because of the large numbers of residents exposed to this risk, the cost of doing nothing would result in an increasing number of people, many of them young, developing cancer and suffering other health effects; this extends to wildlife too. We have long proudly held a constitutional liberty in this country to personally make informed choices over the risks we exclusively take against our own health and bodily integrity. Regarding cancer, these ethos appear in California law through Proposition 65. Cell tower radiation is far worse than purchasing a cup of coffee, processed meat, BPA plastics, and MTBE gasoline. Such purchases are all informed choices. Unlike the latter, cell towers incessantly and non-consensually intrude radiation into our bodies with harmful cumulative exposure. Moreover, carcinogenic risk is not simply additive; there are synergistic effects because when cellular repair is consumed by one genotoxin, DNA is far less protected against additional mutagenic threats such as radon gas, Ultraviolet light, or "recreational splurges." Callous infliction of bodily harm and disregard for home equity is un-American. We can do better."

Tahoe Residents for Actual Prosperity of the 4G/5G moratorium said the simple high school physics assumption that radiation can only cause cancer by being of a high enough photon energy (UV/X-ray) to dislodge electrons and break chemical bonds is wrong. A preponderance of scientific evidence clearly indicates that radio frequency (RF) radiation causes reactive oxidative species (ROS) in living cells and free radical production. Microwave radiation alters the antioxidant repair mechanism resulting in a buildup of reactive oxidative stress. Free radical DNA damage results, as well as reproductive harm and some electro-hypersensitivity effects. Laboratory toxicology experiments show DNA damage directly resulting from microwave RF exposure, and epidemiology has found cancer rates near cell towers are upwards of three to four times higher than background rates; this aggregate rate approximates the vehicular fatality rate in the US! Despite long emerged science, the captured FCC continues to apply an outdated standard it imported from the "National Council on Radiation Protection" in 1996 before cell phones were widely adopted or any direct science existed to expose actual health effects. The FCC exposure standards are now 10,000 times higher than the 0.1 $\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ recommended by current science. Cell towers should not be located less than 1,500 feet (~500 m) from the public or sensitive wildlife. Telecommunications are a trillion-dollar industry, and their corporate lobbying has been tremendous. The TRPA is not prohibited from regulating RF emissions limits as it is neither a state

nor local agency (Lake County Estates, Inc, v. Tahoe Reg. Planning Agency, 440 US 391, 401, (1972).

Jacqueline London said she's requesting a moratorium on the implementation of cell towers. While there are the many commonly discussed health issues from radio-frequency radiation, that this Board should take seriously, she's concerned that the unique construction materials of these towers pose a significant danger to Lake Tahoe water quality. Rainwater flushing down the many cell towers wash UV-degraded microplastics, particles of synthetic fiber, dyes, leached chemicals, detergents, and manufacturing residues from "stealth tower" artificial pine needles, intermixed with machine oils, and printed circuit-board treatments from the Antenna mounts. This will introduce both microplastics, and soapy, oily, toxic residues into the stormwater drainages and thus Lake Tahoe. Microplastics have been identified as an emerging threat to the lake, often entering it from urban runoff.

Many cell towers also require construction and installation of a diesel tank for an emergency generator. A leak of any sort above ground or into the water table from any of these facilities could cause catastrophic and irreversible damage to the lake, its scenic shoreline, and the intermediate wetlands and riparian areas that are habitat for aquatic life, waterfowl, and fragile alpine plants. It could also contaminate drinking water wells. A diesel spill would cause direct poisoning of wildlife and plants. A spill or leak could occur from a fueling accident, corrosion, or cracking of the tank through earthquakes, land subsidence, frost heaving, extreme thermal stress, or by blunt impact from the falling of any of the many surrounding pine trees during a violent winter storm.

Frederick de Moleyns said he addresses you with heavy concerns about the rapid cell tower deployment in the Tahoe Basin. There is a vast and rapidly growing body of hard science proving that the radiation used by this technology is an emerging threat to the Tahoe Basin.

The most prestigious scientific journal NATURE published several articles on the effects of radiofrequency (RF) radiation on migratory birds, butterflies, bees, other insects, and mice, which make it unequivocal that RF radiation has the potential to harm, harass, or stress wildlife populations. NATURE also recently published a new study confirming RF radiation causes oxidative stress leading to DNA damage. Hundreds of scientific publications demonstrate the potential for serious adverse environmental effects to the protected Lake Tahoe ecosystem. This very fragile alpine ecosystem is along a salient migratory bird path; there is far more at stake than just the human populace. Even where cell tower antennas have ground fencing sufficient to protect humans from RF exposure above the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) limits, migratory birds inclusive of northern goshawks, peregrine falcons, osprey, bald and golden eagles regularly perch in the stands of trees where these antenna towers would be installed. This federally protected wildlife is certainly being exposed to radiation above the FCC's limits designed for human exposure. Peregrine Falcons and Northern Goshawks are federally protected migratory birds, that are further protected within TRPA's designated disturbance free zones.

Because Lake Tahoe is such an incredibly special and environmentally sensitive place, Congress created the TRPA in an unusual manner so as to allow it to create extraordinary environmental regulations, it even permits it to regulate radiofrequency emissions at levels below those chosen by the FCC, if necessary, to protect the basin. The science is now here that this basin does indeed need such protection.

Mono-pine antenna towers are particularly harmful as they mimic predatory bird habitat, and hence invite eagles and hawks to perch within the intense near-field radiation of 50,000-watt ERP antenna panels to their own peril. For this reason alone, the board needs to act. TRPA staff left to their own discretion have already approved a Macro Cell Antenna within the Truckee Marsh Bald Eagle Winter Nesting Site despite our national bird being expressly protected from harm by federal law!

Charles Fairbanks said the cell tower densification required for ever-increasing cellular broadband consumption is not sustainable; adhering to this trend will dramatically change the environmental health and visual character of this region which congress has rightly called a National Treasure. When the region serviced by a macro cell tower is at maximum capacity, the Telecom solution is simply to split the area with an additional tower. As the demand is marketed to the public such as to be exponential, so will the requisite construction of towers. This will ultimately require stands, then groves, and ultimately a forest of iron Mono-pines, requiring removal and artificial replacement our real forest. The dramatic and rare scenic beauty of the Lake Tahoe Region is the reason US Congress recognized Lake Tahoe as national treasure and exercised its unusual and exclusive right to create a bi-state compact in order to protect it. As the agency created and tasked with carrying out this heavy responsibility, you must order a moratorium until you fully understand the eventual visual impact of implementing this infrastructure with the density necessary to function.

Monica Eisenstecken said she's extremely concerned about the rapid increase in the number of cellular facilities at Lake Tahoe. These are dangerous to Tahoe's sensitive environment. Trees, wildlife, birds, insects, plants and more are all negatively impacted. Your Board has never even required study of this issue. TRPA's mission is to protect the environment. While this threat to the environment did not exist when your first Regional Plan was adopted, it is now a severe threat which will only get dramatically worse with the rapid roll out of new 5G infrastructure.

We need a moratorium on new cellular facilities now so that TRPA can create appropriate standards for the protection of Tahoe's sensitive environment. There is ample evidence that increased levels of EMF's are a hazard. Please, take action on this immediately before more damage is done!

Heidi Teachout said with millions of Americans now working and learning at home, many of us are spending more and more time online. While the internet offers us many opportunities for communication, exploration and collaboration, in many homes it brings with it an unseen problem: exposure to radio-frequency microwave radiation ("wireless radiation") that is emitted from all wireless devices, including cell towers, laptops, tablets, game consoles and smartphones. An increasing number of doctors and public health experts are recognizing that our almost constant exposure to wireless radiation is impacting our health. Scientists at Yale University have linked fetal exposure to wireless radiation with abnormal brain development in lab animals, and a recent \$30 million-dollar study by the National Toxicology Program of the National Institutes of Health found "clear evidence" of increased cancer risk as well as DNA breaks associated with exposure to cell phone radiation. The evidence linking parotid gland tumors and certain types of brain cancer with the use of cell phones is strong and growing. Studies have consistently shown that young children are uniquely vulnerable to the impacts of wireless radiation, as are people with implanted medical devices and those with compromised immune systems. Because the radiation seems to impact our bodies at the cellular level, it can manifest itself differently in

different people. We need a moratorium on new wireless 4 and 5G systems at Lake Tahoe. They are a threat to all of us. Won't you please begin to protect those of us here with families?

Norm Nash said his family played a major role in developing many of the initial subdivisions at North Lake Tahoe, and in Washoe County. With the benefit of his years of experience with Tahoe, he can say with some certainty that the majority of visitors to Tahoe, and in particular Tahoe homeowners and residents, are not there to enjoy gambling and nightlife in some isolated environment staring at a screen in artificial settings. They are there because they value a direct and palpable connection with nature and have a desire to step away from the hectic pace of modern life in the Bay Area, Sacramento or Reno. Our private development at Incline Lake, for example, thrived for 70 years as a place for homeowners and their guest to interact with the natural beauty of the lake and the magnificence of the Sierras within a comfortable drive from Reno. It was preserved as a natural and unadulterated ecosystem within the larger Tahoe Basin. He's sure that a cell tower in the immediate area of those homes would be met with fierce resistance. Cellular facilities are not only well-documented to be hazardous to the environment, but they would instantly result in a dramatic drop in the fair market values of surrounding homes. As it is relevant to your mission as Board members, however, we can safely say that the latest cellular bells and whistles are not only unnecessary to the Tahoe experience, they are an impediment to it. The goal of the recreation element of the Regional Plan is to manage recreation consistent with the guidance provided in the recreation threshold policy statements to "ensure equilibrium between the region's natural endowment and its manmade environment" (Public Law 96-551/TRPA Compact). 5G and 4G are indisputably hostile to Tahoe's "natural endowment". They are also hostile to the manmade environment in terms of property values and public health. There is no equilibrium that can exist if TRPA persists in approving every cell tower that the telecom industry seeks to profit from. If TRPA will not stand up for the natural environment and its residents it is quite simply failing in its mission as defined in the Compact.

Amanda Reinhard This is a cry-out for help! "We the People," which include a daily growing of many in your community, have become educated on the harms of cell tower technology, and microwave frequency radiation. We demand a moratorium on current cell tower technology deployment based on the science that is already in place. Tahoe cannot take this risk. You are an agency that is ultimately responsible for the health and wellbeing of the Lake Tahoe basin and its communities. It's in your best interest to protect the people as well. The studies and the facts being reported are very real. If these cell projects continue deploying this destructive technology, our basin will be destroyed. I'm sure you want to do a great job and protect the basin. Studies show our forest and fauna, lake ecosystem, animal population, pollinators, air quality, streams, and wetlands will suffer greatly and ultimately cause death from this. We currently are fighting and presently quarantined to evade the COVID-19. We are in a serious situation. The cellular technology is going to give us a new face for fighting for our lives. She can't imagine with all the documented factual information from real science and the voices of the people, you would want to continue a project that would be detrimental to the Tahoe basin and the people. The "buck stops here" with your decision. Our fate is in your hands. Studies have shown our health will be affected. People around the world are actually dying from new cell tower technology, particularly in Switzerland, China and Italy. Where it is most effected by the Corona virus. 3,000 doctors from around the world have signed petitions to bring awareness that this is a deadly and dangerous technology. It is unacceptable to allow large cell "mono pines" towers in any of our neighborhoods. Her family moved to South Lake Tahoe 35 years ago to be free of a cosmopolitan fast-paced lifestyle; to live healthy, active, outdoor lifestyles and not be bathed in toxic EMF

May 27, 2020

frequencies. In 2015, 215 scientists in 41 countries proved that Electromagnetic fields effect all living organisms. They have petitioned the U.N., refer to <https://www.emfscientist.org> This technology effects our DNA. All the relevant facts have been presented to your agency from herself, and professional experts, doctors, scientist and your public. Your community has people in it that actually care about the environment and the people.

Eric Windheim said he's a Certified Building Biology Environmental Consultant & Certified Electromagnetic Radiation Specialist. In 1959 his family boated from Camp Richardson to Meeks Bay: He was awed by the natural beauty of the pristine lake and basin then and now 61 years later. Sadly, it looks like big city wireless radiation toxicity is proliferating without true environmental review or constraints in the Tahoe basin. Cell towers are sprouting up in residential and wildlife areas.

Since the TRPA Regional Plan of 1987, the Update of 2012 and the 2015 Threshold evaluations did not discuss or evaluate the wholistic impact of WRTF facilities on the environment and its inhabitants. He urges you to create a temporary moratorium, right now, until you do so. This will mean a ban on consideration, construction or upgrade of any and all WRTFs immediately. Other commenters will supply the studies and papers that clearly document the harm, injury and damage that Radio Frequency Radiation (RFR) has on all living things, worldwide and in the Tahoe Basin. More and more the American People are waking up to the hazards of WRTFs and the false safety purported by the FCC and industry organizations. Unwitting reliance upon so-called thermal only safety guidelines adopted or created by the agencies and organizations that are captured by or serve the wireless industry is not wise or defensible. A captured agency like the FCC can't be relied upon to protect the Tahoe basin. Please see this link for documentation on how the FCC is captured: https://ethics.harvard.edu/files/center-for-ethics/files/capturedagency_alster.pdf

Above all, people do not want these WRTF anywhere near their homes or schools. My profession as a Building Biologist and Electromagnetic Radiation Specialist is based in science and uses nature as a model. The goal for clients is to detect, measure, assign a risk level, suggest and effectuate solutions that reduce the EMF exposure in the house. When they do, both clients and their pets feel better: this is one reason he gets about half of all his clients from medical doctors and pediatricians in particular. He sees the tremendous pain, suffering injury and damage.

Josh Moore is very concerned about the coming 5G systems that are already appearing around the Lake. He doesn't want them, and don't know anyone here who wants a 5G transmitter anywhere near them. My understanding is, however, that they need to be close to all of our residences because of their limited range. He's shocked to hear that you haven't even looked at the dangers of these things. Please don't force these down our throats without looking carefully at all the evidence of their harm on the environment and our local population!

Steven Veit-Carey said he'd like to direct your attention to FCC bulletin No. 65, section 4, entitled Controlling Exposure to RF Fields. This is the current standard that all cell companies are familiar with and has been around for 20 years. The FCC could not foresee microcell towers in neighborhoods and thought cell antenna would only be on top of tall buildings and on remote ridge tops. Their concern was for people in office buildings and high rise hotels that would be close to these RF emitting antenna. They never thought the general public would ever be close enough to be exposed. The bulletin

states that compliance requires that people who will be near broadcast antennas should not get any closer than 15 meters (or just under 50 feet). The bulletin goes on to say that when accessibility to cell antennas is restricted within the 50 foot perimeter the facility can then certify that it complies with FCC requirements. In addition, bold print states that the FCC is worried about exposure limits not emission limits. This brings in a time factor. The longer you are in an RF field the more exposure you have (sort of like a sun burn). This comes in to play when maintenance workers need to work inside the 50 ft. restricted area. The FCC guidelines state, "The work may have to be divided up and carried out during several intervals of time." The occupational exposure time recommended by FCC guidelines is six minutes. The FCC is serious about this as they imposed fines of \$85,000 on two cell phone companies that co-located on top of an apartment building for not securing a 50 foot perimeter.

Susan said we need a temporary moratorium now to stop and reflect on what you are unintentionally allowing to happen. Profits for the telecom industry profit at the expense of the environment. Solid science that shows a serious threat to the environment from this complete failure to address the issue. TRPA's mission is to preserve your ability to protect the environment from his threat. It may already be too late in some areas, but you can at least prevent further degradation if you act now to impose a moratorium on" any new wireless facilities.

Tracy Reinhard said at least make sure the cell tower projects are safe before implementing them. As a resident of beautiful Tahoe, she's not sure about this technology being the most helpful right now in combating the Covid-19 19 pandemic, due to the super frequencies and because she's no scientist she always makes sure the microwave door is closed before nuking food. She knows the environment means a lot to you as we fight as a team for the Tahoe basin. Putting tower projects on hold could make sense as we have a new pandemic to deal with in addition to the unknowns of this super tech towers. Our collective and individual immune systems are most vulnerable due to the pandemic before the pandemic we were worried and now we feel the towers will not help the situation but only accelerate the demise of health of living things in the Tahoe basin.

Ben Lebovitz said his concern is over the impeding efforts to install cellular infrastructure that is injurious to the neighborhood. The evidence is overwhelming and the public outcry for support to the constituents residing in the basin is alarming. A petition demanding an immediate moratorium on all cellular facilities has reached over 3,600 signatures. The applications provided from the telecom industries have been riddled with errors, from distance to buildings, property land coverage errors and would exist upon previously marked sensitive TRPA land and waterway maps, errant presentations of visual impact and deceptively displaced natural and protected creeks to appease the presentation. It is unlawful that a consideration to produce cellular infrastructure with falsified information be considered and approved. The city and TRPA have an important decision to thoroughly fact check against the evidence presented and can win. Pressuring big wireless to install fiberoptic infrastructure to support their mission will not only protect the lives and environmental executive orders but achieve a goal of support. The language around fear for communication during forest fires is a fake threat. The cellular towers above ground are a grave threat to the safety and health during a forest fire.

They would be the first to erupt and would limit our potential communication during an emergency. Having updated fiberoptic infrastructure would provide greater safety for the community and preserve the natural and environmental concerns. Additionally, city owned fuse boxes and harsh penalties would allow the city to retain financial gains in the threat of big wireless greed.

Many cell towers also require construction and installation of a diesel tank for an emergency generator. A leak of any sort above ground or into the water table from any of these facilities could cause catastrophic and irreversible damage to the lake, its scenic shoreline, and the intermediate wetlands and riparian areas that are habitat for aquatic life, waterfowl, and fragile alpine plants. It could also contaminate drinking water wells. A diesel spill would cause direct poisoning of wildlife and plants. A spill or leak could occur from a fueling accident, corrosion, or cracking of the tank through earthquakes, land subsidence, frost heaving, extreme thermal stress, or by blunt impact from the falling of any of the many surrounding pine trees during a violent winter storm. It would also be advantageous to consider space for community maker space within the event structure. He would be happy to offer some research on how this could benefit the community and the popularized systems for member-based access to create at a local level. Something so important to continue to produce craftsmanship and quality to last within a local footprint. Thank you for your consideration and continued support to our community. Please enact an immediate moratorium on all cellular infrastructure and hear the people's cry.

Lee Afflerbach, from CTC Technology and Energy: "Each small cell is capable of almost putting out the same energy as one macro cell. The radios that they are using are the exact same radios that are up on the macro towers. It's not a different technology, it's the same boxes as on macro towers. He sees them all the time." The following comments are relevant to turning off all Small Cells in the Tahoe Basin during the coming COVID-19 community spread. Rea the relevant correspondence with the City of San Francisco at these links: scientists4wiredtech.com/sebastopol/#death and scientists4wiredtech.com/covid19/#fail The TRPA can take immediate action to stop the melatonin suppression and immuno-suppression of the Tahoe basin population caused by unnecessary, insufficiently regulated, forced exposures to hazardous, pulsed, data-modulated, Radio-frequency Electromagnetic Microwave Radiation (RF-EMR) for strictly frivolous entertainment purposes. These sWTFs are unnecessary, ancillary and frivolous sources of entertainment; they are not needed for making emergency calls, we could already do that in Tahoe basin, without any of these sWTFs.

Nikki Florio said as you know there is a great deal of controversy surrounding 5G human health and environmental impacts. She's writing this letter as a 20+ year environmental professional who has provided information on environmental and human health for decades; with a focus on 5G and related technologies currently. The information provided below is a collection of topics that will demonstrate irrefutably, the negative impacts of 4G/5G on the environment and how it exacerbates the already threatening, wildfire potential throughout the basin. You must exercise the precautionary principle and call for an immediate moratorium on the installation of these towers and lamp/light posts. In approving these towers, you will never meet TRPA's legal mission or environmental goals.

There are nearly a billion and a half insects on Earth and without them, humans will not survive. These are not simply "bugs", but orders of animals that are the foundational to ecosystem health. The bulk of them are pollinators, many also serve primary and secondary sources of food for everything from other insects themselves, to bird, bat, small mammal, amphibian, reptile and other animals found in the Tahoe basin and throughout the world. While there are many threats surrounding their losses one of the greatest is cell tower emissions. Since the early 2000's through today around 250,000 2G and 4G towers have been installed, with current 5G millions more have been added. These towers all add to the microwave and millimeter wave (mmWave) frequencies that are overwhelming them. Regarding ecosystem impacts: fewer insects means fewer flowering plants in the region's meadows, grasslands, marshes, and forests. You will see via info below, how 4G/5G mmWave technology impacts these and other pollinators and why it needs to be halted immediately throughout the basin.

If we lose the millions of species of insects and animals that make up the great pollen nation within the next handful of years and we will if 5G/ IoT is successful, the result will be a final implosion of our food and ecosystems. We will lose animals that have coevolved with flowering plants for millions of years. Plants that we need for food, oxygen, soil stabilization, soil remediation, water and moisture, retention and release, and of course psychological health. "Health and safety" testing of 5G has been fast-tracked by the FCC, a five member entity composed of telecommunication executives. Unfortunately, they neither excised, nor utilized, any meaningful amount of environmental or biological research in regard to 5G. They utilize no independent physicians or scientists as consultants. 5G's spectrum mmWave technology is deadly to insects, birds, bats, amphibians and a host of other animals - including humans.

Her job is to expose Radiofrequency Radiation (RF) impacts leading to the extinction of the great pollen nation: the scope of winged and terrestrial insects, birds, bats, small mammals, primates, salamanders, and other animals that pollinate the bulk of Earth's flowering plants in both ecosystems and food systems. Pollinators are responsible for pollinating the nutrient dense foods that have allowed humans to evolve into the species we are today. Below are some of the impacts, the studies correlating these impacts are numerous.

Insects: Lake Tahoe: Ants, beetles, bees, butterflies, moths, mosquitoes, dragonflies etc. EMFs damage to insects' exoskeleton; primarily to the chitin, leaving them susceptible to bacteria 5G frequencies impact both the antenna and bodies of insects essentially penetrate insects' bodies resulting in "cooking" them; "causing fever-like impacts that affects their behavior, physiology and morphology." EMF Impacts on bee navigation.

Animals: Damage ranges from cellular damage to neurologic impairment.

Soils: Lake Tahoe: meadows, marshes, forest. Damage to soil microbes and cell walls of fungi/chitin Towers Significantly effects microbial diversity and alters vital systems in microbes. Increases susceptibility of pathogens.

Plants and Trees: Lake Tahoe: grasses, wildflowers, domesticated flowers, shrubs, conifers, deciduous.

GOVERNING BOARD

May 27, 2020

In a nutshell, 5G will wreak havoc on plants throughout the basin. Plants and trees absorb mmWaves. From the splitting of DNA/RNA in plants; resulting in toxicity, to gross increase in terpenes (100x) exacerbating forest stress and influencing explosive fires. High frequency towers will mean distressed trees surrounding the towers, and toxic plants - no more backyard gardens, pollen in conifers themselves will be toxic, flowering plants will be toxic for insects, butterflies, hummingbirds, and other pollinators. Damage to trees near towers, see email (see link in emails you received from 3.23.20: TRPA Requested Moratorium on 5G - Env Health and Wildfire Impacts) In essence, 5G will wipe out the bulk of insects, birds, bats, small mammals and other animals in the basin within an extraordinarily brief timeframe. As noted in an earlier meeting, when you go to areas that have 5G you hear only silence. Dr. Martin Pall Biomedical Professor of WSU recently stated that "5G is the stupidest idea in the history of the world." Utilize the precautionary principle. Keep the environment safe from this deadly technology.

Peggy said as the telecom industry accelerates their deployment of cell towers in the Tahoe Basin, it occurs to her and others that the TRPA has no master plan in place to protect Tahoe's scenic and environmental integrity. In my neighborhood of Al Tahoe on the south shore, there have been several unsightly small cell (5G) installations in the public right of way. This is happening in most south shore residential neighborhoods. The recent city approval of a 112 foot mono tower in a view corridor residential neighborhood on Ski Run Blvd. is a further assault to the scenic corridor. Other existing large cell towers like the one in the Tahoe Keys are unsightly and cause questions like, "how did that get approved". Your attention to this matter is needed before this situation gets completely out of control and possibly irreversible. The request is for the TRPA to put in place a temporary moratorium until environmental concerns can be addressed.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Novasel moved to adjourn.

Chair Mr. Yeates adjourned the meeting at 4:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler
Clerk to the Board

The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review